

PROCEEDINGS
OF THE
LITERARY AND PHILOSOPHICAL SOCIETY
OF
LIVERPOOL,

FOR THE
NINETY-SEVENTH (1907-8), NINETY-EIGHTH (1908-9),
NINETY-NINTH (1909-10) SESSIONS

No. LXI.



LIVERPOOL.
D. MARPLE & CO. LEAD STREET.

P
Sei
L

PROCEEDINGS
OF THE
LITERARY AND PHILOSOPHICAL SOCIETY
OF
LIVERPOOL,
DURING THE
NINETY-SEVENTH (1907-8), NINETY-EIGHTH (1908-9),
NINETY-NINTH (1909-10) SESSIONS.

No. LXI.



LIVERPOOL:
D. MARPLES & CO., LORD STREET.
—
1910.

654498

LC. 3. 57

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
LIST OF PRESIDENTS 	v
COUNCIL 	vi
LIST OF ORDINARY MEMBERS 	vii
" HONORARY MEMBERS 	xii
TREASURER'S STATEMENTS 	xiii-xv
REPORT AND PROCEEDINGS—SESSIONS XCVII, XCVIII, AND XCIX 	xvii, xxi, xxvi

PAPERS PRINTED.

SESSION XCVII.

- Mr. J. HAMPDEN JACKSON, F.R.G.S., F.C.I.S.—“ The Public Festivals of the Ancient Temples.”
- Mr. RICHARD STEEL, J.P. — “ Metaphysics of a Business Man.”

SESSION XCVIII.

- Mr. J. HAMPDEN JACKSON, F.R.G.S., F.C.I.S. — “ Further Researches among the *Vectigalia Templorum*.”

SESSION XCIX.

- Rev. E. A. WESLEY, M.A.—“ The Mystery of Matter.”
- Mr. T. L. DODDS, J.P.—“ Walter Pater.”
- Mr. A. E. HAWKES, M.D.—“ An Hour with Virgil.”
- Mr. W. J. B. ASHLEY — “ Edward FitzGerald: a Brief Review of his Life and Character.”
- Mr. BERTRAM B. BENAS, B.A., LL.B.—“ The Genesis and Evolution of Law.”

LIST OF PRESIDENTS

FROM THE FOUNDATION OF THE SOCIETY IN 1812.

ELECTED.

1812	. . .	Rev. THEOPHILUS HOULBROOKE.
1817	. . .	WILLIAM ROSCOE.
1831	. . .	THOMAS STEWART TRAILL, M.D.
1833	. . .	JOSEPH BROOKES YATES, F.S.A.
1839	. . .	Rev. JAMES MARTINEAU, LL.D.
1840	. . .	Rev. THOS. TATTERSHALL, D.D.
1843	. . .	JOSEPH BROOKES YATES, F.S.A.
1846	. . , .	Rev. JAMES BOOTH, LL.D., F.R.S
1849	. . .	JOSEPH BROOKES YATES, F.S.A.
1852	. . .	JOSEPH DICKENSON, M.A., M.D., F.R.S.
1855	. . .	ROBERT MCANDREW, F.R.S., F.L.S.
1856	. . .	THOMAS INMAN, M.D.
1859	. . .	Rev. HENRY HUGH HIGGINS, M.A.
1862	. . .	WILLIAM IHNE, PH.D.
1863	. . .	JAMES A. PICTON, F.S.A.
1866	. . .	Rev. C. D. GINSBURG, LL.D.
1869	. . .	J. BIRKBECK NEVINS, M.D.
1872	. . .	ALBERT JULIUS MOTT, F.G.S.
1875	. . .	[Sir] JAMES A. PICTON, F.S.A.
1877	. . .	JOHN J. DRYSDALE, M.D., M.R.C.S.
1879	. . .	[Sir] EDWARD R. RUSSELL.
1881	. . .	EDWARD DAVIES, F.C.S., F.I.C.
1883	. . .	RICHARD STEEL, J.P.
1885	. . .	WILLIAM CARTER, LL.B., M.D., B.Sc.
1887	. . .	JAMES BIRCHALL.
1889	. . .	Rev. HENRY HUGH HIGGINS, M.A.
1890	. . .	B. L. BENAS, J.P.
1892	. . .	Principal RENDALL, M.A., Litt.D.
1894	. . .	J. BIRKBECK NEVINS, M.D.
1896	. . .	JOHN NEWTON, M.R.C.S.
1897	. . .	RICHARD J. LLOYD, D.Lit., M.A., F.R.S.E.
1899	. . .	Rev. E. N. HOARE, M.A.
1900	. . .	J. MURRAY MOORE, M.D., M.R.C.S., F.R.G.S.
1901	. . .	Rev. E. A. WESLEY, M.A.
1903	. . .	Rev. W. E. SIMS, A.K.C.L.,
1905	. . .	A. THEODORE BROWN.
1906	. . .	JAMES T. FOARD.
1907	. . .	J. HAMPDEN JACKSON, F.R.G.S., F.C.I.S.
1909	. . .	ALFRED E. HAWKES, M.D.
1910	. . .	THOMAS L. DODDS, J.P.

COUNCIL.

 SESSION XCIX, 1909-1910.

President :

ALFRED E. HAWKES, M.D.

Ex-Presidents :

Sir EDWARD R. RUSSELL.

EDWARD DAVIES, F.C.S.,
F.I.C.

RICHARD STEEL, J.P.

WILLIAM CARTER, LL.B.,
M.D.

B. L. BENAS, J.P.

Rev. G. H. RENDALL, M.A.,
Litt.D.

Rev. E. A. WESLEY, M.A.

Rev. W. E. SIMS, A.K.C.L.

A. THEODORE BROWN.

J. HAMPDEN JACKSON, F.R.G.S., F.C.I.S.

Vice-President :

T. L. DODDS, J.P.

Honorary Treasurer :

J. W. THOMPSON, B.A.

Honorary Secretary :

KENNETH COOK, A.C.A.

Honorary Librarian :

ALFRED W. NEWTON, M.A.

JOHN MELLOR.

Mrs. SEPHTON.

ROLAND J. A. SHELLEY,
F.R.Hist.S.

W. LYON BLEASE, LL.M.

Rev. E. HICKS, D.D.

Mrs. FOARD.

BERTRAM B. BENAS, B.A.,
LL.B.

Col. J. M. McMASTER, V.D.

E. G. NARRAMORE, L.D.S.
(Eng.).

Mrs. SERGEANT.

ORDINARY MEMBERS

ON THE SOCIETY'S ROLL AT THE CLOSE OF THE 99TH SESSION

Life Members are marked with an asterisk ().**Associates are marked with a dagger (†).*

-
- Nov. 8, 1909 Allen, Edward, M.Inst.C.E., *Glentruan, Aigburth-road*
- Nov. 8, 1909 Anderson, A. H., 9 *Sandon-street*
- †Nov. 9, 1908 Ashley, W. J. B., 15 *Harland-road, Higher Tranmere, Birkenhead*
- Nov. 13, 1876 Ball, Geo. Henry, 15 *Gambier-terrace, Hope-street*
- Nov. 22, 1909 Barrell, W. J., LL.B., 14 *Harrington-street*
- Oct. 28, 1907 Benas, Bertram B., B.A., LL.B., 4 *Wason-chambers, Harrington-street*
- Dec. 10, 1866 Benas, Baron Louis, J.P., 5 *Princes-avenue,*
EX-PRESIDENT
- Jan. 9, 1882 Benas, Phineas A., 5 *Princes-avenue*
- Nov. 8, 1909 Black, John, 25 *Alexandra-drive, Princes-park*
- Oct. 9, 1905 Blease, W. Lyon, LL.M., *Croxteth-road, Sefton-park*
- Oct. 7, 1895 Bramwell, Miss, Eye and Ear Infirmary, *Myrtle-street*
- †Oct. 8, 1906 Brookfield, Samuel, *Lisboa, Woodend-park, Grassendale*
- Oct. 31, 1892 Brown, A. Theodore, *The Nunnery, St. Michael's Hamlet,* EX-PRESIDENT
- Oct. 1, 1894 Candlin, W. J., 48 *Prussia-road, Hoylake*
- Oct. 25, 1909 Capstick, Edward, *Alexandra Road, New Brighton*

- Oct. 11, 1909 Collie, C. H., Bank of Liverpool Ltd., *Water-street*
- Dec. 20, 1909 Cook, Kenneth, A.C.A., *African-house*, 6 *Water-street*, HON. SECRETARY
- †Oct. 8, 1906 Crawford, Mrs., 40 *Rodney-street*
- Feb. 14, 1910 Curtis, Miss Felicia, 14 *Avonmore-avenue*, *Mossley Hill*
- Nov. 12, 1883 Daly, Chas., *Berey's-buildings*, *George-street*
- Feb. 10, 1908 Dodds, Thomas L., J.P., *Charlesville*, *Birkenhead*, VICE-PRESIDENT
- Nov. 28, 1892 Douglas, Robert R., *Oaklands*, *Grassendale*
- Nov. 18, 1889 Duncan, W. A., *Great Charlotte-street*
- Nov. 14, 1887 Eastley, Richard, 23 *Danby-terrace*, *Exmouth*, *Devon*
- Oct. 14, 1907 Foard, Mrs., 21 *Lancaster-road*, *Birkdale*
- Oct. 29, 1888 Forster, Walter P., 17 *Tarleton-street*
- *Dec. 12, 1892 Gladstone, Robert, Jun., B.C.L. M.A., *Vale-road*, *Woolton*
- Oct. 29, 1877 Green, Robt. Frederick, 66 *Whitechapel*
- Oct. 17, 1899 Griffiths, Miss Nelly, 20 *Salisbury-road*, *Wavertree*
- Oct. 17, 1892 Harley, George, 1 *Water-street*
- Oct. 1, 1894 Hawkes, Alfred E., M.D., 15 *York-avenue*, PRESIDENT
- Oct. 25, 1909 Hemingway, John, 1 *Meadowcroft-road*, *Wallasey*
- Nov. 26, 1906 Hicks, Rev. E., D.D., *The Vicarage*, *Fairfield*
- †Nov. 13, 1905 Hickson, Miss Mary, *Claughton Firs*, *Oxton*
- Jan. 7, 1895 Higgins, Miss Maud Longuet, 79 *Bedford-street South*
- Oct. 30, 1893 Holt, Alfred, *Crofton*, *Sudley-road*, *Aigburth*
- Mar. 10, 1879 Hughes, John W., *Allerton*
- Jan. 27, 1908 Jackson, Miss E. M., L.R.A.M., *Westdene*, *New Brighton*
- Oct. 4, 1897 Jackson, J. Hampden, F.R.G.S., F.C.I.S., *Westdene*, *New Brighton*, Ex-PRESIDENT

- Nov. 22, 1909 Jackson, Mrs., *Westdene, New Brighton*
- Jan. 24, 1910 Johnson, Miss H. M., 17 *Rutland-avenue, Sefton-park*
- Jan. 26, 1863 Johnson, Richard C., F.R.A.S., 7 *Sweeting-street*
- April 29, 1889 Jones, Morris P., J.P., *Airlie House, Hoylake*
- Oct. 25, 1909 Kitchener, Elliot, M.A., *Greenbank School, Sefton-park*
- Jan. 21, 1901 Lee, Chas. George, M.R.C.S., L.R.C.P., 11 *Princes-avenue*
- Dec. 10, 1894 Lee, John, B.A., 73 *Temple-road, Birkenhead*
- *Dec. 11, 1871 Leigh, Richmond, M.R.C.S., L.S.A., *Reitz, Orange River Colony, S. Africa*
- Feb. 14, 1910 MacLean, H. C., LL.M., *The Laurels, Newton-by-Chester, Cheshire*
- †Oct. 25, 1909 Mathias H. D., 105 *Arundel-avenue, S.*
- Oct. 30, 1882 McMaster, Col. John Maxwell, V.D., 19 *Castle-street*
- Nov. 8, 1909 McMillan, Miss E., 8 *Fernwood-road, Aigburth*
- Nov. 17, 1873 Mellor, James, *Weston, Blundellsands*,
- Dec. 14, 1874 Mellor, John, *Rutland House, Nicholas-road, Blundellsands*
- March 14, 1910 Morris, Edward E., 18 *Parkfield-road, S.*
- March 14, 1910 Morris, Miss Anne Gladys, 18 *Parkfield-road, S.*
- March 6, 1882 Morton, George Henry, 14 *Grove-park*
- *Oct. 21, 1867 Muspratt, Edmund K., Ph.D., J.P., *Seaforth Hall, Seaforth*
- Nov. 26, 1900 Narramore, Edward G., L.D.S., Eng., 39 *Canning-street*
- Oct. 1, 1894 Nevins, J. Ernest, M.B., Lond., 32 *Princes-avenue*
- Nov. 2, 1896 Newton, Alfred William, M.A., *The Athenæum,*
HON. LIBRARIAN

- Nov. 2, 1885 Oulton, William, J.P., *Hillside, Gateacre, and Albert-buildings, 22 Preecons-row*
- Oct. 1, 1894 Parry, Joseph, C.E., City Water Engineer, *Woodbury, Waterloo-park, Waterloo*
- Nov. 4, 1861 Philip, Thomas D., *Weldon, Bidston*
- Nov. 8, 1909 Raffalovich, Rev. I., *12 Selborne-street*
- †Nov. 22, 1909 Rawlinson, Rev. W. M., *The Manse, Derwent-road*
- *Nov. 17, 1851 Redish, Joseph Carter, *Lyceum, Bold-street*
- Oct. 31, 1881 Rennie, J. W., *38 Castle-road, Liscard*
- Oct. 25, 1909 Richardson, R. D., *82 Devonshire-road, Princes-park*
- Oct. 15, 1894 Rutherford, Arthur, B.A., *41 Castle-street*
- Nov. 12, 1883 Rutherford, William Watson, M.P. (Messrs. Rutherfords), *41 Castle-street*
- Dec. 12, 1892 Rye, Miss Ellen L., *Bedford College, Bedford-street*
- March 19, 1866 Sephton, Rev. John, M.A., *90 Huskisson-street*
- Oct. 15, 1883 Sephton, Mrs., *90 Huskisson-street*
- †Oct. 14, 1907 Sergeant, Mrs. A. C., *Stockport*
- Oct. 18, 1897 Shelley, Roland, J. A., F.R.Hist.S., *Seymour-road, Broadgreen*
- Oct. 31, 1898 Sims, Rev. W. E., A.K.C.L., *The Vicarage, Aigburth, EX-PRESIDENT*
- Nov. 2, 1903 Sims, Mrs. W. E., *The Vicarage, Aigburth*
- April 4, 1870 Smith, James, *37 North John-street*
- Feb. 23, 1863 Smith, J. Simm, *4 Bramley-hill, Croydon*
- Nov. 18, 1878 Steel, Richard, J. P., *18 Hackins-hey, EX-PRESIDENT*
- Nov. 8. 1909 Stephenson, William, *17 Pembroke-place*
- Oct 12, 1908 Stuart, F. Ronald, *Drummoyne, Blundell-sands*
- Oct. 25, 1909 Sykes, B. C., *12 Devonshire-road, Princes-park*
- †Oct. 10, 1904 Symes, Chas., Ph.D., *53 Canning-street*
- *Feb. 19, 1865 Taylor, John Stopford, M.D., Aberdeen, F.R.G.S., *Percy-street, Liverpool*

- Oct. 4, 1897 Thomas, His Honour Judge, LL.D., B.A., 41
Lilley-road, Fairfield
- Oct. 21, 1878 Thompson, J. W., B.A., Lond. and Victoria,
Hazel-bank, Freshfield, HON. TREASURER
- Nov. 30, 1896 Wesley, Rev. Edmund Alfred, M.A., 93
Chatham-street, EX-PRESIDENT
- Nov. 4, 1901 Wesley, Mrs., 93 *Chatham-street*
- April 1, 1901 Wilberforce, Prof. L. R., M.A., 5 *Ashfield-*
road, Aigburth
- Oct. 11, 1909 Winter, Harry, 30 and 32 *Moorfields*
- †Nov. 8, 1909 Wright, Miss, 29 *Greenheys-road, Princes-*
park
- †Nov. 8, 1909 Wright, Miss M. T., 29 *Greenheys-road,*
Princes-park

HONORARY MEMBERS.

LIMITED TO FIFTY

- 1.—1870 Lord Avebury, F.R.S., 2 *St. James's-square, London*
- 2.—1870 Professor Sir Henry E. Roscoe, F.R.S., etc., Owens College, *Manchester*
- 3.—1870 Sir Joseph Dalton Hooker, M.D., F.R.S., etc., *The Camp, Sunningdale, Berks.*
- 4.—1870 The Rev. Christian D. Ginsburg, LL.D., *Oakthorpe, Palmers Green, Middlesex*, EX-PRESIDENT
- 5.—1877 The Earl of Crawford and Balcarres, F.R.S. Foreign Secretary of R.A.S., etc., 2 *Cavendish-square, London, W.*
- 6.—1877 Albert C. L. Günther, M.A., M.D., Ph.D., F.R.S., *Kew*
- 7.—1877 Dr. Leidy, Academy of Science, *Philadelphia.*
- 8.—1877 Dr. Franz Steindachner, Royal and Imperial Museum, *Vienna*
- 9.—1897 Henry Longuet Higgins, 75 *Gunterstone-road, West Kensington, London, W.*
- 10.—1899 Rev. G. H. Rendall, M.A., Litt.D., *Charterhouse School, Godalming*, EX-PRESIDENT
- 11.—1901 Rev. Walter William Skeat, Litt.D., LL.D., D.C.L., Ph.D., Professor of Anglo-Saxon, Cambridge, since 1878, 2 *Salisbury Villas, Cambridge*
- 12.—1903 Edward Davies, F.C.S., F.I.C., 28 *Chapel-street*, EX-PRESIDENT
- 13.—1908 William Carter, M.D., B.Sc., LL.B., Lond., F.R.C.P., Lond., *Deganwy, N. Wales*, EX-PRESIDENT
- 14.—1908 Sir Edward R. Russell, *Victoria Street*, EX-PRESIDENT

TREASURER'S ACCOUNT, 1906-7.

Dr. *The LITERARY AND PHILOSOPHICAL SOCIETY OF LIVERPOOL.* Cr.

RECEIPTS.		PAYMENTS.	
1906—Oct.	£ s. d.	1906-7	£ s. d.
To Balance in the Bank, as per A/c.	32 9 9.	By Rent	12 0 0
" Subscriptions, viz. :—		" Printer	41 15 8
52 at £1 1 0	£54 12 0	" Refreshments	14 11 4
12 at 0 10 6	6 6 0	" Wreath for Mr. Foard's Funeral	1 1 0
" Arrears	60 18 0	" Lantern (Tomkinson)	2 2 0
" Sale of Volumes	1 11 6	" Advertising	0 11 6
" Bank Interest	0 5 0	" Hon. Treasurer's Expenses	2 9 8
	1 1 6	" Hon. Secretary's Expenses	0 11 10
		" Hon. Secretary—Purchase of Volumes	0 2 0
		" Balance in the Bank	21 0 9
			<u>£96 5 9</u>
Arrears, 1906-7	£5 5 0		
			<u>£96 5 9</u>

Audited and compared with vouchers and found correct,

E. A. WESLEY.
R. C. JOHNSON.

TREASURER'S ACCOUNT, 1907-8.

Dr.		The LITERARY AND PHILOSOPHICAL SOCIETY OF LIVERPOOL.		Cr.	
RECEIPTS.		PAYMENTS.			
1907-8	£ s. d.	1907-8.	£ s. d.		
To Balance in the Bank, as per last A/c....	21 0 9	By Rent	12 0 0		
" Subscriptions, viz. :—		" Printer	36 12 11		
49 at £1 1 0	£51 9 0	" Refreshments	12 11 8		
10 at 0 10 6	5 5 0	" Lantern (Tomkinson)	2 2 0		
	—	" Hon. Treasurer's Expenses	1 8 3		
" Arrears	2 2 0	" Hon. Secretary's Expenses	0 10 3		
" Sale of Volumes	1 4 0	" Balance in Bank	16 6 5		
" Bank Interest	0 10 9				
	<u>£81 11 6</u>				
					£81 11 6

Audited and found correct,

R. C. JOHNSON.

E. A. WESLEY.

12th October, 1908.

TREASURER'S ACCOUNT, 1908-9.

The LITERARY AND PHILOSOPHICAL SOCIETY OF LIVERPOOL.

Cr.

RECEIPTS.		PAYMENTS.	
1908-9.	£ s. d..	1908-9.	£ s. d.
To Balance in the Bank, as per last A/c....	16 6 5	By Rent	12 0 0
" Subscriptions, viz.:—		" Printer	20 19 2
50 at £1 1 0	£52 10 0	" Refreshments	16 6 0
10 at 0 10 6	5 5 0	" Lantern (Tomkinson)	2 2 0
" Arrears	57 15 0	" Hon. Treasurer's Expenses	1 5 6
" Sale of Volumes	2 12 6	" Hon. Secretary's Expenses	0 6 0
" Bank Interest	0 12 0	" Loss on Dinner	2 19 5
	0 5 0	" Postages for President's Letter	0 5 0
		" Van Gruisen & Son—Hire of Piano ...	0 10 6
		" Balance in Bank	20 17 4
	<u>£77 10 11</u>		<u>£77 10 11</u>

Audited and found correct,

E. A. WESLEY.

R. C. JOHNSON

11th October, 1909.

PROCEEDINGS
OF THE
LIVERPOOL
LITERARY AND PHILOSOPHICAL SOCIETY.

NINETY-SEVENTH SESSION, 1907-08.

ROYAL INSTITUTION, LIVERPOOL.

ANNUAL MEETING.

The Annual Meeting of the Society was held at the Royal Institution, on 14th October, 1907.

Mr. J. Hampden Jackson, F.R.G.S., F.C.I.S. (Vice-President), occupied the chair.

The following report of the retiring Council was read and adopted:—

REPORT OF THE COUNCIL.

Ten meetings of the Society were held during its ninety-sixth Session, 1906-07.

Upon the eve of the opening meeting of the second half of the Session came the news of the sudden decease of the Society's deeply respected President—Mr. James T. Foard, Barrister-at-Law—who became a life member in the year 1855, from which date the Society was at frequent intervals favoured with contributions, both written and oral, the product of his rich experience and gifted and

cultured mind. Mr. Foard had a wide and well-deserved reputation as a Shakespearean scholar, and his papers on Shakespearean subjects witness to his admirable industry and literary talent.

The Vice-President, Mr. J. Hampden Jackson, F.R.G.S., F.C.I.S., fulfilled the duties of the chair to the end of the Session.

Three times was the Society favoured by contributions from gentlemen outside its membership. By the invitation of Mr. Foard, the President of the Warrington Literary and Philosophical Society (Mr. Arthur Bennett, J.P.), and Mr. Harold Rathbone contributed papers; and at the closing meeting, Dr. Richard Caton, J.P., read a paper on "Recent Excavations on the Holy Island of Delos."

The attendance throughout the Session was remarkably uniform, shewing an average of 35.

The Hon. Treasurer's accounts were submitted and adopted.

The following officers were elected for the ensuing session: — Vice-President, Mr. Richard C. Johnson, F.R.A.S.; Hon. Treasurer, Mr. J. W. Thompson, B.A. (re-elected); Hon. Librarian, Mr. A. W. Newton, M.A. (re-elected); Hon. Secretary, Mr. Edward G. Narramore, L.D.S., Eng. (re-elected).

The following members were elected to serve on the Council in place of three retiring members:—Mr. Chas. Daly, Mr. Percy Trew, Mr. W. Lyon Blease, LL.B.

The Vice-President, Mr. J. Hampden Jackson, then assumed the Presidency of the Society, and delivered his inaugural address, entitled, "The Public Festivals of the Ancient Temples."

ORDINARY MEETINGS.

II. 28th October, 1907. The President, Mr. J. Hampden Jackson, occupied the chair. Mr. W. Lyon Blease, LL.B., read a paper entitled "Lord Brougham."

III. 11th November, 1907. The President, Mr. J. Hampden Jackson, occupied the chair. A paper, entitled "The Sun and his Surroundings," was read by the Vice-President, Mr. Richard C. Johnson, F.R.A.S.

IV. 25th November, 1907. The chair was taken by the President, Mr. J. Hampden Jackson. Mr. Robert Frederick Green read a paper entitled "Some National Customs: a Study of Contemporary Prejudice."

V. 9th December, 1907. The President, Mr. J. Hampden Jackson, occupied the chair. Mr. Richard Steel, J.P., read a paper entitled "Metaphysics of a Business Man."

VI. 27th January, 1908. The President, Mr. J. Hampden Jackson, occupied the chair. Mr. Harold E. Young delivered a lecture entitled "A Wayfarer in Rural Japan." The lecture was illustrated by lantern pictures.

VII. 10th February, 1908. The President, Mr. J. Hampden Jackson, occupied the chair. Mr. G. H. Morton read a paper entitled "Decorative Art: its Object and Influence." The paper was illustrated by sketches, wall-papers of various dates, and stencil designs.

VIII. 24th February, 1908. By the invitation of Professor Wilberforce this meeting was held in the George Holt Physics-Laboratory of the University of Liverpool. The members were entertained to tea previous to the meeting by kind invitation of Professor Wilberforce. The President, Mr. J. Hampden Jackson, occupied the chair. Professor L. R. Wilberforce delivered a lecture entitled

“Spinning Tops and Gyrostats,” and the lecture was illustrated by numerous experiments.

IX. 9th March, 1908. The chair was occupied by the President, Mr. J. Hampden Jackson. Acting upon the recommendation of the Council, Mr. Wm. Carter, M.D., B.Sc., LL.B., F.R.C.P., Ex-President, was elected an Honorary Member of the Society. A paper entitled “The Present Aspect and Evolution of Woman,” was read by Mrs. Isabel Foard, the discussion following being of great interest.

X. 23rd March, 1908. The President, Mr. J. Hampden Jackson, occupied the chair. The special business of this meeting was the election of a President of the Society for the ensuing session. Dr. Ernest Nevins proposed, and Mr A. Theodore Brown seconded, that Mr. J. Hampden Jackson be elected for a second year of office. This proposition was carried unanimously. Col. J. M. McMaster, V.D., then read a paper entitled “The Volunteers of Great Britain, 1859–1908,” several lantern illustrations being shown recalling important stages in the history of this national movement.

MEMBERS ELECTED DURING THE SESSION.

Mr. Bertram B. Benas, B.A., LL.B., Mrs. Foard, Miss E. M. Jackson, L.R.A.M. (re-elected), Mr. T. L. Dodds, J.P.

ASSOCIATE ELECTED DURING THE SESSION.

Miss Hawkes.

The attendances during the session were as follows:—Annual Meeting, 111; Ordinary Meetings, 30, 36, 24, 30, 51, 42, 102, 56, 28.

NINETY-EIGHTH SESSION, 1908-9.

ROYAL INSTITUTION, LIVERPOOL.

ANNUAL MEETING.

The Annual Meeting of the Society was held at the Royal Institution, on 12th October, 1908.

Mr. J. Hampden Jackson, F.R.G.S., F.C.I.S., President, occupied the chair.

The following report of the retiring Council was read and adopted:—

REPORT OF THE COUNCIL.

During the Ninety-Seventh Session of the Society ten meetings were held, and the average attendance rose to 51. The President, Mr. J. Hampden Jackson, occupied the chair on every occasion.

The Honorary Membership of the Society was accepted by Mr. William Carter, M.D., B.Sc., LL.B., F.R.C.P., on his retirement in consequence of removal to North Wales. There were during the Session two more resignations, and we lost by death three valuable members of long-standing usefulness to the Society. Chief among these was Dr. John Newton, M.R.C.S., President of the Society in 1896-97, whose many learned and interesting contributions to our *Proceedings*, and whose genial and friendly personality will long be remembered and treasured by us. Four new members and one Associate were elected to our number.

Many circumstances contributed to enliven and add interest to the Session. The Public Dinner on 19th

December, 1907, at the Adelphi Hotel, was a successful function, the Lord Mayor and Lady Mayoress (Dr. and Mrs. Caton), and the Pro-Chancellor of the University, Dr. E. K. Muspratt, being our principal guests. Eighty-seven members and friends sat down to dinner.

The lectures and literary papers of the Session proved of exceptional interest, and in particular those of two new members of the Society, Mr. W. Lyon Blease, LL.B., and Mrs. Foard, gave high gratification to us all. Of the ten addresses no fewer than six were illustrated, and the Society was again indebted to the courtesy of Professor L. R. Wilberforce, M.A., for entertainment at the University Physics Laboratory, on the occasion of his fine lecture on "Spinning Tops and Gyrostats."

The discussions during the Session have been of general interest and have well maintained the reputation of the Society.

The Hon. Treasurer's accounts were submitted and adopted.

The following officers were elected for the ensuing session:—Vice-President, Mr. Richard C. Johnson, F.R.A.S. (re-elected); Hon. Treasurer, Mr. J. W. Thompson, B.A. (re-elected); Hon. Librarian, Mr. A. W. Newton, M.A. (re-elected); Hon. Secretary, Mr. Edward G. Narramore, L.D.S., Eng. (re-elected).

The following members were elected to serve on the Council in place of three retiring members:—Mrs. Isabel Foard, Rev. Ed. Hicks, D.D., D.C.L., Mr. G. H. Morton.

The President, Mr. J. Hampden Jackson, F.R.G.S., F.C.I.S., then delivered an address entitled: "Further researches among the *Vectigalia Templorum*."

ORDINARY MEETINGS.

II. 26th October, 1908. The President, Mr. J. Hampden Jackson, occupied the chair. Rev. Edward Hicks, D.D., D.C.L., read a paper entitled "Music: some Facts and Features in its History and Development." The paper was illustrated by means of the pianoforte and blackboard sketches.

III. 9th November, 1908. The President, Mr. J. Hampden Jackson, occupied the chair. Mr. Bertram B. Benas, B.A., LL.B., read a paper entitled "The Genesis and Evolution of Law."

IV. 22nd November, 1908. The President, Mr. J. Hampden Jackson, occupied the chair. A letter was read by the President in reference to the production of *Samson Agonistes* in Liverpool, in connection with the Milton Ter-centenary celebration. Rev. E. A. Wesley proposed, Mr. R. J. A. Shelley seconded, and it was carried unanimously, that the President and Mr. A. Theodore Brown should represent the Society on the Committee to be formed. Mr. T. L. Dodds, J.P., then read a paper entitled "Walter Pater."

V. 14th December, 1908. The President, Mr. J. Hampden Jackson, occupied the chair. The President referred with deep regret to the death of the Society's respected life member, Mr. Robert Durning Holt. The President referred to a letter received from Mr. William Joel in connection with the *Samson Agonistes* production, regretting that owing to want of time for the necessary arrangements, it would not be possible to give the performance in Liverpool. The Rev. E. A. Wesley then read a paper entitled "The Mystery of Matter."

VI. 25th January, 1909. The President, Mr. J.

Hampden Jackson, occupied the chair. The President referred to the sad loss sustained by the Society in the death of Mr. Victor E. E. Nevins. Professor Oliver Elton, M.A., delivered a lecture entitled "William Cowper."

VII. 8th February, 1909. The President, Mr. J. Hampden Jackson, occupied the chair. Mr. Roland J. A. Shelley, F.R.Hist.S., read a paper entitled "Jacobite Lancashire," which was illustrated by a map of the period.

VIII. 22nd February, 1909. The President, Mr. J. Hampden Jackson, occupied the chair. A paper entitled "Our National Records" was read by Mr. Robert Gladstone, Jun., B.C.L., M.A. The paper was illustrated by specially prepared lantern slides.

IX. 8th March, 1909. Mr. J. Hampden Jackson, the President, occupied the chair. Mrs. Isabel Foard read a paper entitled "Elementary Education and its Defects."

X. 22nd March, 1909. The President, Mr. J. Hampden Jackson, occupied the chair. Mr. Joseph Parry, C.E., read a paper entitled "St. David, the Patron Saint of Wales, and St. David's Cathedral," several lantern slides being shown to illustrate the lecture.

XI. 5th April, 1909. The President, Mr. J. Hampden Jackson, occupied the chair. Mr. Jackson offered his thanks to the members for their attendance and for their hearty co-operation in the somewhat exceptional Committee-work of the session, and expressed regret that the Vice-President, Mr. R. C. Johnson, had found himself unable to accept the Society's invitation to the Presidential Chair. Upon the proposition of the President, seconded by Mr. Richard Steel, J.P., Dr. A. E. Hawkes was elected President for the coming session.

A vote of thanks was proposed by Mr. R. C. Johnson, and cordially offered by the meeting to Mr. E. G. Narramore for his services as Hon. Secretary to the Society

during a term of seven years. Mr. A. Theodore Brown then read a paper entitled "Alfieri: a Few Notes."

MEMBER ELECTED DURING THE SESSION.

Mr. F. Ronald Stuart.

ASSOCIATES ELECTED DURING THE SESSION.

Mr. W. J. B. Ashley, Miss Sarah A. Jones.

The attendances during the session were as follows:—
Annual Meeting, 49; Ordinary Meetings, 42, 26, 29, 28,
41, 38, 41, 24.

NINETY-NINTH SESSION, 1909-10.

ROYAL INSTITUTION, LIVERPOOL.

ANNUAL MEETING.

The Annual Meeting of the Society was held at the Royal Institution, on Monday, 11th October, 1909.

The retiring President, Mr. J. Hampden Jackson, F.R.G.S., F.C.I.S., occupied the chair.

The following Report of the retiring Council was read and adopted :—

REPORT OF THE COUNCIL.

In presenting to the members of the Society the Annual Report for the Ninety-eighth Session, the Council asks their approval of the steps that they have taken during the year to arrest the continuous decline of the membership. A special Committee appointed on 12th March, 1909, was empowered to sit during the recess, and take such action on the Council's behalf as might appear best for the recruitment of the Society's members and finances. The report of this Committee on 27th September has been unanimously accepted, and a movement commenced for the increase of our roll by at least 50 members before 1912, when the centenary year occurs. A Circular setting forth the claims of the Society has been distributed, and the members have been personally appealed to for co-operation in accomplishing the objects desired.

During the year we have lost by death our venerated Ex-President, the Rev. E. N. Hoare, M.A. ; our young and

genial member, Mr. Victor E. E. Nevins; and Mr. William Wortley, who for 25 years had attended the meetings of the Society. By removal from the district we have also lost two members; and from the roll of Honorary Membership the honoured name of Dr. Cuthbert Collingwood, M.A., M.B., M.R.C.P., F.L.S. This gentleman, who joined in 1858, and was elected an Honorary Member on removal to London in 1865, was for several years Honorary Secretary and Vice-President of the Society, and "to his untiring exertions" (said the President at the Jubilee celebrations in 1862) "we were indebted for the organization and success of all the arrangements at that festival."

Sir Edward R. Russell, a member since 1872, and President of the Society in 1879-80, has been elected an Honorary Member.

The papers read during the session have been in every way worthy of the Society's standard, and it is matter for regret that the finances have not allowed of their publication throughout. The Society has continued reasons for congratulation upon the excellence of the essays produced by its newer and younger members, the share so ably taken by ladies in its programmes, and the sustained interest and educative influence of its discussions.

The Public Dinner of the Society, held at the Adelphi Hotel on 1st December, was well attended, the principal guests being the Lord Mayor and Lady Mayoress of Liverpool, Sir Donald MacAlister, K.C.B., D.C.L. (Vice-Chancellor of the University of Glasgow), and Mr. T. Shepherd Little, M.A., the new Stipendiary Magistrate of Liverpool.

The Hon. Treasurer's accounts were submitted and adopted.

The following officers were elected for the ensuing session:—Vice-President, Mr. T. L. Dodds, J.P.; Hon.

Treasurer, Mr. J. W. Thompson, B.A. (re-elected); Hon. Librarian, Mr. A. W. Newton, M.A. (re-elected). The Honorary Secretaryship of the Society, vacant by the retirement of Mr. E. G. Narramore, L.D.S., Eng., was for the present left unfilled. Mr. Jackson kindly undertook to act *pro tem*.

The following members were elected to serve on the Council in place of three retiring members:—Col. J. M. McMaster, V.D., Mr. E. G. Narramore, Miss Hawkes.

The President, Dr. Alfred E. Hawkes, then assumed the chair, and delivered his inaugural address, entitled, "An Hour with Virgil."

ORDINARY MEETINGS.

II. 25th October, 1909. The President, Dr. A. E. Hawkes, occupied the chair. The Rev. W. E. Sims, A.K.C.L., read a paper entitled "Samuel Taylor Coleridge: Poet, Critic, and Philosopher."

III. 8th November, 1909. The President, Dr. A. E. Hawkes, occupied the chair. Allusion was made from the chair to the death of the Society's Honorary Member, Rev. W. H. Dallinger, LL.D., F.R.S., F.R.M.S., who joined the Society in 1870, and was elected Honorary Member on his departure from the vicinity in 1881. His Honour Judge Thomas, LL.D., B.A., then read a paper entitled "Some Modern Aspects of International Law."

IV. 22nd November, 1909. The President, Dr. A. E. Hawkes, occupied the chair. A paper, entitled "Cervantes: his Life and Works," was read by Professor J. Fitzmaurice Kelly (Fellow of the British Academy).

V. 20th December, 1909. Dr. A. E. Hawkes, President, occupied the chair. Dr. John W. Ellis read a paper

entitled "The Thomas Hardy Country" (Wessex), illustrating it with a large number of lantern slides of exceptional beauty.

VI. 24th January, 1910. The President, Dr. A. E. Hawkes, occupied the chair. At this meeting Mr. Kenneth Cook was elected to the office of Honorary Secretary. Mr. Richard C. Johnson, F.R.A.S., gave a brief description of the new comet. Professor T. Witton Davies, B.A., Ph.D., D.D., then read a paper entitled "Recent Semitic Finds (Monumental, Epigraphic, etc.) and Some Things they Teach us."

VII. 31st January, 1910. The President, Dr. A. E. Hawkes, occupied the chair. A paper was read by Mr. W. J. B. Ashley entitled "Edward FitzGerald: a Brief View of his Life and Character."

VIII. 14th February, 1910. The President, Dr. A. E. Hawkes, occupied the chair. Mr. Richard C. Johnson gave some further particulars regarding the new comet, after which Mrs. Isabel Foard read a paper entitled "The Mesozoic Life Period (Amphibians, Reptiles, and Extinct Monsters)," illustrating the same with lantern slides.

IX. 28th February, 1910. The President, Dr. A. E. Hawkes, occupied the chair. Mr. B. L. Benas, J.P., read a paper entitled "Some Aspects of Omar Khayyám."

X. 14th March, 1910. Dr. A. E. Hawkes, the President, occupying the chair, referred to the loss sustained by the Society in the death of Dr. J. Campbell Brown, who had been a member of the Society since 1869. A resolution of sympathy with Mrs. Brown was passed upon the motion of the President, supported by Mr. A. Theodore Brown and Mr. R. C. Johnson. Dr. Chas. G. Lee, M.R.C.S., L.R.C.P., then read a very interesting paper on "Deaf Mutism and the Deaf Mute," illustrated by photographs, lantern-slides, and mounted anatomical specimens.

XI. 21st March, 1910. The President, Dr. A. E. Hawkes, occupied the chair. Upon the proposition of Mr. A. Theodore Brown, seconded by Mr. J. Hampden Jackson, and supported by several other members, Mr. T. L. Dodds, J.P., was elected President for the 100th Session of the Society. Mr. A. W. Newton then read his paper on "Some Questions of Plagiarism."

MEMBERS ELECTED DURING THE SESSION.

Mr. A. H. Anderson, Mr. Edward Allen, M.Inst.C.E., Mr. John Black, Mr. W. J. Barrell, LL.B., Mr. C. H. Collie, Mr. Edward Capstick, Mr. Kenneth Cook, Miss F. Curtis, Mr. J. Hemingway, Mrs. Anne Jackson, Miss H. M. Johnson, Mr. Elliot Kitchener, M.A., Mr. H. C. MacLean, LL.M., Miss E. McMillan, Mr. Ed. E. Morris, Miss A. G. Morris, Mr. R. D. Richardson, Rev. I. Raffalovich, Mr. Wm. Stephenson, Mr. B. C. Sykes, Mr. H. Winter.

ASSOCIATES ELECTED DURING THE SESSION.

Miss Wright, Miss M. T. Wright, Mr. H. D. Mathias, Rev. W. M. Rawlinson.

The attendances during the session were as follows:—
Annual Meeting, 81; Ordinary Meetings, 42, 46, 41, 19, 58, 30, 40, 51, 40, 39.

LIBRARY.

The Hon. Librarian wishes to point out to the new Members and Associates, and to remind those of longer standing :—

- (i) That the volumes of our *Proceedings* (Nos. 1–60) are stored in two bookcases in the Royal Institution, viz., the bookcase in the passage on the ground-floor leading to the offices, and the bookcase in the front room on the first floor. The former of these is the property of the Society. We have no duplicates of the earlier volumes, but members may obtain copies of any volume beginning with the 22nd (with the exception of vols. 40 and 58) on payment of one shilling for each volume.
- (ii) That the remainder of the Society's Library was removed in 1899 to the University, and is now under the care of Dr. John Sampson, the Librarian. The reason for its transfer was the want of space for proper storage in the Royal Institution, whereby many volumes were misplaced and lost, and also our inability to meet the expense of binding.

The Library consists of (1) Donations and Annual Contributions from Universities and Societies kindred to our own. These include British, Colonial, and Foreign Societies, and are mostly received in exchange for our own *Proceedings*; and (2) Monographs presented by their authors (*e.g.*, “Notes by a Field Naturalist in the Western Tropics,” by Rev. H. H. Higgins, and “Ancient Faiths embodied in Ancient Names,” by Dr. Thos. Inman—both former Presidents of our Society).

Some of the Annual Contributions are placed as soon as received on the Departmental shelves of the University. Others are stored in Room No. 5. Any member of our Society can obtain access to them by presenting his card to the University Librarian or his assistants.

A few copies of the hand-list, prepared by Dr. John Sampson in 1899 still remain, and members applying for copies will receive them (*gratis*) in the order of application.

THE PUBLIC FESTIVALS OF THE ANCIENT TEMPLES.

BY J. HAMPDEN JACKSON, F.R.G.S., F.C.I.S.

PRESIDENT.

I APPRECIATE deeply the honour conferred upon me by this venerable and distinguished Society in elevating me to this chair. During ninety-five years of the Society's activity, its roll of presidents has borne many eminent names: men of scholarship, of learning, and of professional distinction in the city of Liverpool, and, whilst realising my unworthiness to rank with them in those respects, I will only say that in attachment to the Society itself, in desire to advance its interests and usefulness, and to continue cultivating those many genial friendships made here, I hope to be found equal to my predecessors. It has been good to be a member of this Society; to hear its lectures and essays and take part in their discussion; to learn here so much that has been interesting; to unlearn some things that were good to unlearn. During the ten years of my association with you I can recall no evening wasted upon idle or profitless topics; no session that did not deepen in me the conviction of the Society's great usefulness to this city, in which it has been so long and worthily maintained. We all desire to see its numbers increased, and—as its President—I would invite ladies and gentlemen to become members or associates with us, and thus to share those good things in prospect for the Society during the session we to-night inaugurate.

[Two years back I had the honour of lecturing to this Society upon the “Sources of Temple Income at the Chief Sanctuaries of the Ancient World.” The matter prepared for that occasion proved in excess of the time at disposal; to-night, therefore, I resume my discourse at the point then reached, namely, the consideration of public festivals as a main auxiliary of revenue to the temples.]

I.

For the origin of religious festivals, we must go back over the ground traced in our previous enquiry into the origin of temples. We found both from Chaldean

sculpture and Egyptian paintings that the earliest edifices associated with the religious idea in those countries were primitive huts, like the dwellings of savage man in his hunting and fishing stage of evolution. And anthropology shows us the earliest religious festivals at the same primitive stage of society. Professor Robertson-Smith says:—

It is a mistake to suppose such festivals date only from the beginning of agricultural life, with its yearly round of seed-time and harvest, for in all parts of the world annual sacraments are found, not merely among agricultural or pastoral races, but even in rude hunting tribes that have not yet emerged from the totem stage.

(a) Every Polynesian and Australian and American-Indian village, and every African native settlement, still holds these primitive festivals. They all have their dancings and drummings and drinkings at the changes of the moon; their yearly ceremonies at the solar equinoxes and solstices; and their recurrent festive sacrifices to the ancestral dead. We may venture roughly upon a calendar form for them, premising that variety exists between the practices of various races at particular festivals, however nearly assimilated may be the general periods of festival-observance.

FESTIVE CYCLES (Hunting and Fishing Man).

(MONTHLY) LUNAR FESTIVALS (1) New moons: dances and fetish rites.

(2) Full moons: orgiastic indulgences.

(YEARLY) SOLAR FESTIVALS (3) Spring equinox: river taboo removed.

(4) Summer solstice: initiation to adolescence mysteries.

(5) Autumn equinox: forest taboo removed.

(6) Winter solstice: tribal military ceremonies.

FESTIVALS OF THE DEAD

(7) Yearly commemorative sacrifices.

My lantern illustrations show these seven primitive festivals as observed by native peoples of Central, Eastern and Western Africa at the present day.

The tribal mysteries are sometimes a lunar, sometimes a solar, recurrence. In general, the youths' and maidens' initiations take place at different periods of the year, there being preliminary payments of dues and offerings for each adolescent, and the ceremonies are availed of for placing on each the sacred or tribal marks. At the yearly rites upon the river human sacrifices are offered, after which, for a consideration, the sorcerer takes off his taboo from the fishery, causing the finny tribe to multiply miraculously in the stream. At the forest festival he removes his taboo against hunting, after like sacrifices and payments, whereupon the game necessarily abounds. At the tribal military display, frequently the chief festival of the year, the adult males assemble in arms and execute war-dances, the sorcerers thereafter prolonging certain incantation-dances through the night. The festivals for the dead usually refer to recently deceased chiefs, being held on the anniversaries of their burial rites. Sacrifices to appease their ghosts are followed by feastings to keep up recollections of their authority and long ancestry.

(b) We will next add to the primitive calendar those ancient festivals that appear to have arisen during man's nomad period, the period during which (as I shall later show) festival processions were evolved.

ADDITIONAL FESTIVALS (shepherd-nomad stage).

STELLAR FESTIVALS: Sacrifices at constellational or zodiacal trans-
itions.

SHEEP-SHEARING FEAST: Firstlings of flock and tithes of wool paid.

FESTIVAL OF CLAN-GOD: Yearly opening of sacred oracle.

Nomad-man continued to observe the moon and sun

festivals of his primitive ancestors, whilst adding to his calendar other astronomical feasts based upon stellar movements. He also followed former practice in the matter of adolescence festivals, of tribal mysteries, and festivals of the dead. Naturally his spring festival became dissociated from the river-life he had so long abandoned, but he adapted it into a festival of sheep-shearing, the taboo removed being no longer the fishery taboo, but one against shearing or selling wool before the priestly authority had appropriated every tenth fleece. Similarly the forest festival changed in purport, as nomad-shepherd groups spread beyond the woodland countries to pasturages widely apart. Each group preserved the primitive worship, but lapse of time brought difference in observances and in the very names of their deities; hence multiplication of clan-gods, each with some stated yearly festival, and of clan-oracles, each the only true oracle, and all others spurious.

(c) The nomad period ends, and man settles with his flocks and herds on well-watered plains, where crops can be grown. Further additions are now made to his festival calendar, these being of increased importance to the sacred exchequer.

ADDED FESTIVALS: AGRICULTURAL (herdsman) STAGE.

SEED-TIME FESTIVAL: Solemn sacrifices.

HARVEST FESTIVAL: Firstfruits and tenths paid.

FESTIVAL on Temple-dedication anniversary.

NATIONAL FESTIVAL: Sanctuary tribute paid.

A great temple now rises in every city, attesting the growth of sacerdotal power, and each has its dedication festival commemorating the first sacrifice offered upon its altar. That day becomes the leading festival day in each city concerned, and pilgrimages begin to these city shrines, sacred fairs becoming associated with these city

festivals. In course of time related clans unite into a nation, or rival cities clash in war, and two or three of them go under to the conquering city, whereupon the vanquished deities become subordinated in the pantheon, and the temple of the paramount city becomes the national sanctuary. Amphictyonies are formed, and compulsory tributes and offerings flow into the central sanctuary of each dominant nation.

I have dwelt upon the evolution of these primitive calendars in order that you may the better grasp the idea that every temple festival of every nation of the ancient world appears lineally traceable to one or other of these primitive feasts. In all alike we find the moon and sun festivals, and the star festivals, the festivals for the removal of taboos, the sacred mysteries, the adolescence festivals, the clan-god's day, the oracle-opening day, the *dies natalis* of the temple, and the festivals of the dead. They are called by many names, hidden under various disguises, re-consecrated under fabulous and miraculous auspices, amalgamated here, split up elsewhere, but there they all are. Let us, as we study the calendars of Egypt, Jerusalem, Greece, and Rome, keep this in memory.

II.

(a) Along the wall of an Egyptian temple we see this painted record of king HOR-EM-HEB of the 18th dynasty (1332 B.C.) carried in procession to the temple of Ptah at Memphis at the coronation or accessional festival, held by every Egyptian sovereign, when he sacredly swore to keep all the festivals of the gods, and not to tamper with their dates in the calendar. Throughout Egyptian history this festival (called by Ptolemæan Egypt the ANAKLETERIA) was held yearly at Memphis and other cities on the anniversary of each successive coronation.

(b) At Medinet Habu we find the other record here shown: RAMESSU III, of the 20th dynasty (1202 B.C.), depicted with his priests, nobles, and warriors, as marching at the festival of Osiris. And the tombs and temples of Egypt abound with similar paintings of the national festivals. It is impossible as yet to compile any adequate list of these, and a calendar for any of the Egyptian sacred cities is equally out of the question. The appended list indicates only the best known of the Sanctuary festivals, most cities named being metropolitan centres of the Nomes. But there were hundreds more of the ordinary temple festivals; Medinet Habu alone held eight per month, and the duration of each Egyptian feast (with its days sacred from all work and civil employment) was excessive; the Ptah festival at Memphis, for instance, lasted ten days.

EGYPTIAN TEMPLE FESTIVALS (leading centres).

ABYDOS	...	...	Festivals of Osiris.
BUBASTIS	...	...	„ Bastet.
BUSIRIS	...	...	„ Dedu.
CHNUM	...	...	„ Thoth.
DENDERA	...	...	„ Hathor.
EDFU	...	...	„ Horus.
ELEPHANTINE	...	...	„ Chnum.
FAYOUM	...	...	„ Sobk.
HERMONTIS	...	...	„ Mont.
KOPTOS	...	...	„ Min and of Isis.
MEDINET HABU	...	...	„ Ptah and of Osiris.
MEMPHIS	...	...	„ Ptah and of Osiris.
OMBOS	...	...	„ (?).
ON	...	...	„ Ra and of Atum.
SAIS	...	...	„ Neit.
SIUT	...	...	„ Anubis and of Epuatu.
THEBES	...	...	„ Amen and of Min.

(c) Herodotus tells us that during certain months every day was given up to temple festivals of one kind or

another, and we have remarkable proof of the burden they entailed upon worshippers in an inscription from Beni Hasan. The Nomarch of the 12th Nome, CHNUM-HOTEP, boasts to the gods of the amount of his offerings and persistence of his devotions at all their yearly festivals. Let us put his statement into tabular form. "At all these festivals," says CHNUM-HOTEP, "I offered bread, beer, cattle, and fowls":—

- | | |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| (1) "The year's beginning." | (10) "The entry of grain." |
| (2) "The opening of the year." | (11) "The twelve monthly festivals." |
| (3) "The increase of the year." | (12) "The twelve half-monthly festivals." |
| (4) "The diminution of the year." | (13) "All the festivals on the plain." |
| (5) "The close of the year." | (14) "All those on Anubis, his hill." |
| (6) "The great festival." | |
| (7) "The great burning." | |
| (8) "The lesser burning." | |
| (9) "The five intercalary days." | |

The greater part of this long list of festivals is simple of identification:—(1) The civil year's beginning dated from the king's accession, and the first festival on the list must therefore have been the Ptah festival of the royal accession, held in Memphis. (2) The sacred year in Egypt opened with the great Niloa festival on 20th July, when the river inundation commenced, at the summer solstice, and the statue of the god was carried in procession through every town and village in the land. Registrations took place that day in all the temples of the metropolitan cities, and the rejoicing population sang hymns, played music, and danced; so we are informed. (3) "The increase of the year" is clearly the spring equinox, when the mysteries of Isis took place at Koptos. Fasting and sacrifices preceded a festive meal and a great procession in honour of the goddess. (4) "The diminution of the year" is consequently the autumn equinox,

when the mysteries of Osiris took place at Abydos and elsewhere. We read that five days were given to the death and burial mysteries, earth ploughing and search for the mangled body of the god, joy at its discovery, and solemn re-burial of the remains; that seven days followed of the SOKARIS (or hawk-headed Osiris) festival, during which the priests marched in procession with the sacred ark and images and holy emblems round all the temples; every pomp of state and ceremonial that could be devised was lavished on these proceedings, which wound up on the twelfth (consecutive) day by the erection of the DEB pillar, the carriage of the sacred ark down to the sea-coast, and a deadly club fight of the priests and votaries of the god.

(5) "The close of the year" in Egypt was the 360th day; there being 12 months of 30 days each. This may therefore have been the festival of Bast, at Bubastis, a Dionysiac orgie, described by Herodotus as attended by 700,000 adults. We read that, after abundant sacrifices, more wine was drunk than in all the rest of the year put together, and the conduct of the worshippers as they passed along the Nile in boats, with singing, music, and clapping of hands, and stopped opposite every village to dance and strip themselves, is recorded by the great historian. (6) "The great festival" is assuredly that of Amen at Thebes, on the *dies natalis* of that temple, and the official yearly opening of its world-famed oracle. On this occasion a ram was killed and skinned, its pelt being spread over the image of the god. Then the ram was mourned for, then it was buried with pomp in the sacred tomb of Amen. (7) "The great burning" was probably the Baal festival, when the great pyre was lit and infants thrown into the flames, as well as other human sacrifices offered. It may have been, however, only the festival of Ra, the sun-god, at On (or Heliopolis). (8) "The lesser

burning" might thus mean the festival of Khons, the moon-god, at Ombos, where there was a torch-light procession. (9) "The five intercalary days" were added by the Egyptians to every year's end, making their year as nearly as possible a solar one. If these days were the Horus festival at Edfu, they may have coincided with astronomical honours to Orion, the constellation supposed by the Egyptians to contain the soul of Horus. All this, however, is conjecture. (10) About "the entry of grain," I think there can be little doubt, for the festival of Min at Thebes is well known to have been the festival of harvest first-fruits in Egypt. (11) Similarly with the "twelve monthly festivals," which must be those of the new moon, possibly the lantern festivals, of which Herodotus says that each one lasted several days at the new moon, and were repeated at the full moon. (12) "The twelve half-monthly festivals" clearly mean those full-moon repetitions, involving several days' duration for each. (13) "All the festivals on the plain" probably means all the festivals of the first sycamore Nome, which was consecrated to Anubis, god of the dead. Whilst (14) "All the festivals on Anubis, his hill," certainly means all the festivals of the twelfth Nome, which was consecrated to that god, and was called "his hill."

It would appear therefore that CHNUM-HOTEP must have attended some 50 to 60 festivals yearly, and paid sacrificial dues and presented offerings at each. The majority of these festivals would be of several days duration, and when we have allowed for the time taken up by slow journeys backwards and forwards from city to city, and festival to festival, it is hard to see where he could get any time to himself all the year through.

(d) Among Egyptian festivals not identified in CHNUM-HOTEP's list are the following named by Herodotus:—

- (Name) BUDINI: In honour of Dionysos (BES) where everybody fell into drunken excess.
- (City) BUSIRIS: In honour of Osiris, where thousands of men and women beat themselves, and many Carians present cut their faces with knives in honour of the god.
- (City) BUTOS: In honour of Buto (MA'AT). Sacrifices only were here offered.
- (City) SAIS: The LUCHNOKAIA festival of Neft or Neith. This was a great Feast of Lanterns like those in China and India. All over Egypt the people who could not go to this festival lit up lanterns round their houses and across the thoroughfares at night.
- (Name) NYSA: Festival of the Ethiopian population resident in Egypt.
- (City) PAPREMIS: In honour of Mars (MONT). After sacrifices and other rites the priests and votaries of the god had a great club fight in his honour outside the Temple at sundown, when many were wounded, and Herodotus avers that many died of their wounds.

(e) Something must be said also respecting the great Sothis or SED festival (as it was so long called), an astronomical feast held every 30 years at the heliacal rising of Sirius or Sothis, the dogstar, which was supposed to contain the soul of Isis. It has been pointed out by Professor Flinders Petrie that records on the tombs, 3,500 years before Christ, show the sovereign attending this festival in state in the eighteenth year of his reign (MERY-RA), and, again, in 2924 B.C.; NEB-TAUI-RA in the second year of his reign, and, again, in 1208 B.C.; MERENPTAH in the second year of his reign; and AMENHOTEP I held it in the ninth year of his reign, so that as it came at 30 years' intervals, it was a purely astronomical festival. But Ramessu II, in his vanity at attaining a thirtieth year of reign, ordered the SED festival to take place then, and only to be held thereafter by kings who attained a thirtieth year on the throne. Thus the festival merged into the

ANAKLETERIA, and became simply an exceptionally brilliant celebration every thirtieth year of what had already been a brilliant festival held yearly.

(f) Now we saw that at Memphis the yearly festival of Ptah-Sokaris lasted over ten days. And we know that at Medinet Habu the same festival, held at the Temple of Amen, lasted over ten days, this inscription (cited by Ermen) being the proof. It relates to a royal festival endowment made for that occasion :

TEMPLE OF AMEN AT MEDINET HABU.

ANNUAL ENDOWMENT FOR

TEN DAYS' FESTIVAL OF PTAH-SOKARIS-OSIRIS.

Day of Festival.	Loaves.		Cakes.		Jugs of Beer.		Oxen and Cattle.		Geese and Birds.		Jars of Wine.
1 ...	145	...	30	...	15	...	—	...	4	...	2
2 ...	310	...	10 (?)	...	24	...	—	...	6	...	—
3 ...	298	...	50	...	110	...	?	...	?	...	?
4 ...	258	...	40	...	168	...	3	...	—	...	2
5 ...	1,237	...	50	...	30	...	1 (?)	...	5	...	2
6 ...	3,694	...	600	...	905	...	5	...	206	...	83
7 ...	305	...	30	...	51	...	—	...	12	...	3
8 ...	50	...	—	...	14	...	—	...	5	...	2
9 ...	385	...	40	...	20	...	—	...	6	...	1
10 ...	177	...	2	...	?	...	1	...	6 (?)	...	15 (?)
	<u>6,859</u>		<u>852</u>		<u>1,337</u>		<u>10</u>		<u>250</u>		<u>60</u>

(Not including large quantities of Honey, Wax, Incense, &c.)

It has been assumed that these endowment loaves and geese and jugs of beer were to feed gratuitously the crowds attending the festival. But at that period Egyptian temples used the sacred tithes levied on their surrounding districts to pay for free entertainment to all pilgrims. It is therefore more likely that (as in India and China and the Malay Peninsula) these endowments of victuals and drink were sold at a profit for temple benefit, and for use as offerings and sacrifices, such "SALES OF HOLY FOOD"

being customary at that period in Syria and Phœnicia, and, later, at certain temples in Greece.

I am indebted to that accomplished and cultured artist Mr. F. A. Bridgeman for the use of his beautiful picture of "The Procession of the Sacred Bull Apis-Osiris at Memphis." You will recall how at this festival Cambyses stabbed the Bull-god to death when finding the city rejoicing and feasting as he entered it after losing his armies in the Sudan.

(g) Egypt was a land of temple oracles, and every oracle in the subjoined list had its festival day of opening, and its fixed period for yearly closing.

EGYPTIAN ORACLE-FESTIVALS.

Dety.	Temple.	Method of Oracle.
AMEN - -	(Thebes) - - -	Sacred barque procession.
AMEN - -	(Libya) - - -	Mouth of priest: during procession.
AMEN - -	(Meroe) - - -	(Unknown).
HATHOR -	(Serabit) - - -	Dreams in or near temple.
BASTET -	(Bubastis) - - -	} By mouth of priest or prophet.
OSIRIS -	(Abydos) - - -	
HORUS -	(Edfu) - - -	
ATUM -	(On) - - -	
KHEM -	(Herakleopolis) -	
NEIT -	(Sais) - - -	
APIS -	(Memphis) - - -	
MA'AT -	(Butos) - - -	
MONT -	(Hermonthis) - -	
OSAR-APIS	(Alexandria) - -	
OSAR-APIS	(Canopus) - - -	
ISIS -	(Philæ) - - -	

The picture I show you of the Procession of the Sacred Barque of Amen at Thebes, dates from 2600 B.C. The rigging and small central figures in the barque were in some way manipulated by the priests to give replies to questioners, and it is known that a high charge was made for consultations of this oracle, both in Thebes and Libya

and at Meroë. Through the courtesy of Professor Flinders Petrie, who has lent me three slides from his fine series of photographs in that valuable book *Researches in Sinai* (Murray, London), I am able to show you the dream-oracle of Hathor, goddess of turquoise, on the hill of Serabit in the Sinai peninsula. The first of these slides shows the mountain quarry where successive kings of Egypt, from 4000 B.C. onwards, kept miners working on state account for turquoise. Hither also it is evident came numbers of adventurers with pickaxe and crowbar to seek their own fortunes. The marks of the mining operations are seen in successive tiers and galleries along the face of the mountain. And in the foreground are rows of miners' huts put up by some sovereign of the 12th dynasty when visiting Serabit with an army of workmen. The second slide shows Professor Petrie's restored model of the temple of Serabit itself, which stood upon the plateau of this rocky region, and the oracle there appears to have developed in something this way: when first turquoises were discovered in a cave at this spot the discoverers associated their good luck with the favour of some deity, and this cave on the plateau was consecrated to the goddess of turquoise. The discovery brought many to Sinai, and soon many sought the little cave shrine to make their offerings, then pass the night in rough stone shelters outside, hoping for dream guidance from the goddess as to where they should work next day to find turquoise. The region being rich in turquoise it happened that many miners had good luck, for which they gave the oracle credit, and the shrine grew into a richly endowed temple, its deity being gradually identified with the Egyptian goddess Hathor. Professor Petrie's third slide shows the rough construction of these sleeping shelters within which worshippers, after preliminary offerings and devotions at the temple, lay waiting for their oracular dreams.

III.

But now we must leave Egypt and turn to the temple festivals of ancient Jerusalem.

The picture before you gives a fair idea of the height of Mount Zion, and the difficult ascent to be climbed by all worshippers bound for the temple on its summit (*arx*). The lame, sick and infirm were exempted from the necessity of personal attendance there on festive occasions, being allowed to send their dues and offerings by the hand of other worshippers of their family or village.

(a) Jerusalem had but one deity and one temple. Babylon and Egypt had gods many and goddesses many. Greece and Rome had not only gods and goddesses, but demigods many and worshipful heroes many, so that these countries and their chief cities had no end of temples, and no end of temple festivals. The following statement demonstrates pretty clearly the advantage of monotheism over polytheism as a matter of national economy in festivals.

TEMPLE FESTIVALS.

COMPARISON OF THEIR NUMBERS AND DURATION.

			Sacred Feasts and Fasts.		Days Duration.		Taboo Days.		Total Days.
JERUSALEM	...	...	24	...	54	...	51	...	105
ATHENS	...	...	113	...	205	...	34	...	239
ROME (Republic)	...	...	123	...	124	...	88	...	212

In regard to Jerusalem the compulsory deduction of one-third of the year for sacred holidays, in a purely agricultural nation, seems serious, but the Jews were slaveholders, and slaves were seldom in evidence at the festivals of any country, or the cultivation of the soil could not have gone on. In Judæa the slaves had always their weekly Sabbath rest, and one or two festival holidays were allowed them in the year; while in Greece and Rome they had seven or eight such occasions.

(b) The Jewish festivals were on the whole typical of those in the calendars of other nations of antiquity, and illustrate what I have told you respecting the identity of origin of religious festivals among the ancients.

THE TWENTY-FOUR JEWISH FESTIVALS (ANALYZED).

MOAIC : New Year festival (seventh moon) : Youths enrolment day.

Eleven other New Moon feasts : Trumpet blowing days.

Three Pilgrim festivals :

THE PASSEVER : Spring equinox period.

PENTECOST (or WEEKS) : Harvest festival.

FEAST OF TABERNACLES : Autumn equinox period.

Day of Atonement : The Maidens' day.

Temple Dedication Anniversary : The Feast of Lights.

POST-EXILIC : The XYLOPHORIA : Feast of wood-carrying.

Fast of Esther and Feast of Mordecai : Purim (or Lots).

Four Fast-days :

SACK OF JERUSALEM.

BURNING OF THE TEMPLE.

SIEGE OF THE CITY.

MURDER OF KING GEDALIAH.

} Festivals of the Dead.

The Jewish year was a lunar year of 355 days. The first point for observance, therefore, in their festival calendar is the monthly feast of the new moon. Each month starting with its new moon festival, there were twelve such festivals in the year. The new moon of the seventh month being the special festival of the Jewish New Year, on this day, as in all other Eastern nations and in Egypt, the enrolment of adolescent youths and other persons took place in the temple, and their names were entered by the sacred scribes into the temple register, or Book of Life as it was called both in Palestine and Egypt.

Next come what are termed the pilgrim festivals, when all Jews but those disqualified by uncleanness or infirmity, etc., must come up to Jerusalem and appear at the temple before Jahveh with their offerings, sacrifices

and dues as prescribed by the law. Following the custom of Egypt, Arabia, Phœnicia, and the Canaanitish peoples, these festivals were fixed at the equinoxes and at harvest.

After them (in the list before you) comes the great sacred fast; the day of atonement; with its expiatory sacrifices conducted by the high priest personally; his frequent entry into the adytum or holy of holies; the expulsion of the scapegoat to the wilderness; the solemn procession bearing the high priest to his house in Jerusalem; then the dispersion of the immense multitude and its reassembly at Olivet to wait the procession of maidens, who all marched together, rich and poor, each clad in one simple garment of white, and danced for hours in the vineyards for the special benefit of many who came on this great yearly occasion to select brides.

Next comes what the Romans call the *dies natalis* and the Greeks the *encænia*. Every temple has its beginning, and the day the altar first smokes with sacrifice is generally treated as its natal day, so as the years revolve we have always this (generally the greatest) festival of the year, the dedication of the temple. The Jewish tabernacle had its anniversary of the pillar of fire and the pillar of cloud. The temple of Solomon had its anniversary of the descent of sacred fire upon the holocaust after the king's prayer on the opening day. The later temple changed this date again to correspond with that of the re-kindling of the fire on its own altar.

The festival of the *XYLOPHORIA*, adopted probably from Egypt or the Semites of Arabia, was one of nine occasions on which sacrificial wood-fuel was cut down and collected for temple use. On eight of these nine occasions, certain families only had the privilege of bringing in these offerings, but on the 15th of Ab, everybody, slaves, proselytes, nethinim, and even illegitimates went out rejoicing to the

woods and cut down and bundled the faggots, then bore them singing in procession to Mount Zion, where the priests, after picking out unfit or worm-eaten pieces, stacked the wood in the temple wood-chamber. On the evening of this festival (as on that of the day of atonement) the maidens of Jerusalem danced in the vineyards of Olivet for the delight of the men assembled to watch them.

Then we come to the post-exilic festivals, instituted after the nation's long captivity in Assyria and Babylon, among corrupt and idolatrous people.

The fast of Esther and the feast of Mordecai have been shown by scholars to be of Babylonian origin, but I need not discuss the pros and cons of that controversy.

Finally we pass to the four national fasts mentioned at foot of the table: that recalling the Assyrian and Roman destructions of the city and carrying of its walls by assault; that commemorating three successive burnings and pillagings of the temple by a foreign foe; that held in memory of Nebuchadnezzar's army forming the first siege of the Holy City; and that recalling the massacre of Gedaliah and his court at Mizpah. These memorial fasts, full of political interest and patriotic meaning as they quickly became in every great nation of antiquity, were the successors of the primitive festivals of the dead, and embodied ceremonies of the deepest popular importance.

(c) We will now look at the Jewish festivals in their calendrical order, taking an ordinary year, not a leap-year, for every third year the Jewish calendar added a leap-year month to keep the seasons right, otherwise—with a year of only 355 days—ten days a year would, in three years time, represent a whole month wrong in the calendar, and at that rate harvest festivals would soon be held in seed time, and *vicê versâ*; so the Jews tagged on a thirteenth month (Ve-Adar) in their leap-year to keep matters adjusted.

FESTIVAL CALENDAR: JERUSALEM.

NISAN .. 1 New Moon	TISHRI .. 1 Seventh Moon: New Year
14 Passover (Preparation)	3 Fast of Gedaliah
15 "	10 Day of Atonement
16 " (First ripe Omer)	15 Feast of Tabernacles
17 "	16 "
18 "	17 "
19 "	18 "
20 "	19 "
21 " (Close of Feast)	20 "
IYAR .. 1 New Moon.	21 " (Close of Feast)
15 Little Passover	22 Octave of the Feast
18 33rd day in Omer	
SIVAN .. 1 New Moon	CHESHVAN 1 New Moon
6 Pentecost (or Weeks)	KISLEV .. 1 New Moon
7 "	25 Dedication of Temple
8 "	26 "
9 "	27 "
10 "	28 "
11 "	29 "
12 " (Close of Feast)	30 "
THAMUS .. 1 New Moon	TEBETH .. 1 New Moon
17 Fast (Taking of Jerusalem)	10 Fast (Siege of Jerusalem)
AB .. 1 New Moon	SHEBAT .. 1 New Moon
9 Fast (Destruction of Temple)	ADAR .. 1 New Moon
15 Feast of Wood Offering	13 Fast of Esther
ELUL .. 1 New Moon	14 Purim (Mordecai)
	15 " (Proper)

The points for observation in this table are: (1) The year begins with the Exodus from Egypt in the month Nisan, but the New Year festival only comes at the seventh moon, in the month Tishri. (2) The position of the three great pilgrim feasts: *Passover* (eight days in Nisan, corresponding to our March/April); *Pentecost* (seven weeks or fifty days later, seven days in Sivan, corresponding to our May/June); *Tabernacles* (eight days in Tishri, corresponding to our September/October); whilst the *CHANUCHAH*, dedication feast of the temple took up eight days in Kislev, (corresponding to our November/

December). (3) The Little Passover on 15 Iyar was for such Jews as had unavoidably been absent from the celebration of the Passover festival. (4) The sacred day on 18th Iyar (called the 33rd day in Omer) was to mark the harvest in the minds of Israel as belonging to Jahveh from the 16 Nisan, when the first ripe sheaf of barley had been waved before the temple altar. (5) Two fasts, the fast of Jerusalem and the fast of the temple, precede the joyous festival of the wood offering or Xylophoria. Two more, the fast of Gedaliah and the fast of atonement, precede the joyous festival of the tabernacles, which was pre-eminently called "the feast of Jahveh"; and two fasts, the fast of the siege and the fast of Esther, precede the joyous national festival of Purim.

(d) The daily proceedings at the three Jewish pilgrim festivals were of considerable similarity, but it will be easy to show you the points that were alike and the points that differed. Moreover, by looking well into them we shall save time, for so much of the proceedings was similar to the ritual and observances in Greece and Rome, and from one we may judge all to a large extent.

I have here a table of what were the common features of Passover, Tabernacles and Pentecost festival ceremonies; and another table afterwards to show what were the special features in which each of these festivals differed from the others. Let us read over table one:—

COMMON FEATURES AT THE THREE GREAT FESTIVALS (JERUSALEM).

1. Preliminary tithing of the flocks and herds all over the land.
2. Public opening and emptying of the temple coffers.
3. Formation of local cavalcades; each headed by district priest.
4. March to Jerusalem, leading victims and carrying offerings.
5. Purifications at the temple, and other preparations.

DAILY PROCEDURE AT ACTUAL FESTIVAL.

1. Midnight opening of the temple-gates.
2. Examination (by priesthood) of the sacrificial animals.
3. Daily morning sacrifice (ROYAL ENDOWMENT).
4. The temple sacrifices, as prescribed for this occasion.
5. Chanting of the HALLEL, with chorus.
6. Sacrifices by the worshippers (as required by code).
7. Their votive and freewill offerings (according to code).
8. The festive meal.
9. Daily evening sacrifice (ROYAL ENDOWMENT).
10. The incense offering.
11. The bénédiction.
12. Choral and accompanied psalm-singing.
13. Ceremonial closing of the temple-gates.

Now that first part is much like what was done in Egypt and in Greece and Rome, and almost entirely like what has been done down to this very year in the temples of India and Siam in connection with great pilgrim festivals.

And most of that second part is, like the first part, only duplicating temple procedure in other countries of the same period as the Hebrew monarchy.

In next dealing with special features of these three festivals, let me preface my table with a few remarks upon the Passover. All round and about the Jews, in Egypt, Phœnicia, Arabia, and among the Canaanites, first-born children were put alive into the flames as an offering to Baal, or Melkarth, or some equivalent deity; the Jews offered lambs as a sacrifice, and spared the lives of their infants, but paid a sacred redemption money for their first-born sons to the temple coffers. Dr. Frazer, in his *Golden Bough*, shows us how the mythical death of the Egyptian first-born was probably made use of by that great patriot and marvellous leader of men, Moses, to guard the Israelites from all danger of falling back into

the child-murder practices of their own race (the Semites), and to keep them apart from the practices of all the neighbouring countries.

SPECIAL CEREMONIES AT THE THREE GREAT FESTIVALS (JERUSALEM).

- PASSOVER: Slaughter of the Paschal lambs at the temple.
 Private Paschal suppers; with ritual.
 Eating of unleavened bread for seven days.
 Procession to cut first sheaf of ripe barley.
 Waving of the grain before JAHVEH; harvest begins.
- PENTECOST: Waving of two loaves before JAHVEH; harvest ends.
 Pentecostal supper to the poor, the foreigner, and the Levite.
 Processional offerings of first-fruits.
- TABERNACLES. Lodging in open booths and sheds.
 Procession to draw water from the sacred pool.
 Pouring out of the water.
 Procession to Kedron for willow-boughs.
 Waving palm and myrtle boughs during the
 "HALLEL."
 Procession of 700 priests round altar, singing.
 Great illumination of the temple courts.
 Torch dance of the Chasidim and "men of deed."
 Destruction of the boughs after final "HALLEL."

Here, again, among these special ceremonies there is hardly an item we cannot find repeated in the festival ceremonials of other countries. Phœnicia, Arabia, and Syria killed first-born babies instead of Paschal lambs. Greece and Rome and Egypt ate festal meals with ritual, but did not stand up to them with their hats on and a travelling staff in their hands. Aliens and slaves and the poor were feasted at the greatest festivals of Greece and Rome. Lodging in booths and open sheds was quite an ordinary feature of the greater festivals in Eastern countries. Drawing water from sacred pools, pouring it out at the altar base, processions to cut wood for fuel or to cut

branches of sacred olives, sacred ashes, sacred laurels, and the waving of these boughs at the temple ceremonials were quite a regular and ordinary feature of festival ritual. Processions of priests, great blazes of light in the temple enclosure, torch-light processions, torch races, torch dances, who does not know they ever were and are still a regular part of the yearly display at the temples of the world?

No! The great distinguishing features of Jewish festivals are not in these lists. They are written large in religious history, and to the end of time will glorify the race and the religion alike. There was no idol statue to be dressed and undressed, to be decked with jewellery, to be carried to a sacred river and washed, and to be fooled around and grovelled before. There was no child-murder nor human sacrifice. There was no sacred orgie of lust and filth and gluttony and drunkenness. All these things were in Egypt, but Moses blotted them out from the observances of the new nation he had practically to create. All these things were at home from day to day in the temples of every Semitic race—that very race to which the Jews belonged. All these things went on long after Moses, and all over the world, but the Jew has never fouled his religion with them, and the glory of a cleaner spiritual conception, a more humane religious code, a disassociation of religion from crime and indulgence and lust, will ever be the true shekinah of the Mount Zion temple and of the Jewish revelation to the world.

(e) The frequent loud blowing of the temple trumpets at festivals, especially at the new moon, and notably throughout the day at the New Year festival, are an interesting feature of the ceremonies. At the opening of the temple gates at midnight, at the slaying of the daily morning sacrifice, as well as at the evening sacrifice, at the pouring

out of the drink offering, and after each section of the singing in the psalms for the day, these silver trumpets blew three loud blasts; and similar use of martial trumpets characterized the festival procedure of other nomadic nations. In the case of the Jews, two of the silver trumpets were of Mosaic origin, and their use indicated in the Book of Numbers as "for the calling of the assembly and for the journeying of the camps." But it is significant that the bodyguard of priests surrounding the ark and sacred vessels, when the Israelites were on the march, had only rams' horn trumpets, the characteristic instrument of all warlike nomads. It was before the blast of seven rams' horns, blown by seven priests about the ark, that the walls of Jericho fell down, for instance, as we can all remember from our Sunday school days. When this nation of shepherd wanderers was on the march, its adult males (called Jahveh's host), mobilized for war, with priest-chieftains at their head, gathered to the note of these sacred horns and trumpets, and guarded the sacred ark and vessels with spear and sword as they moved on; whilst behind, in long array, followed the women and children, the tents and baggage, and the procession closed with an armed rearguard.

We have seen how religious festivals came into the calendar of primitive man; we now may infer how processions of armed men, guarding sacred emblems and sounding trumpets, became identified with temple festivals in the nomad stage of human development.

(f) Before passing from Jerusalem to Greece and Rome, I should like to show you an interesting part of the financial organization at the Jewish temple. In all the ancient temples, offertory boxes—exactly similar to the one I now show you—were used for the collection and deposit of the moneys obtained from fees and dues, and

coins given voluntarily by the worshippers. In the great court of the Jewish temple, however, at a point called "The Treasury," stood thirteen collecting boxes of extraordinary shape, called the Shopharoth or trumpets. Many speculations have been made as to their origin, but probably the adaptation of actual trumpets of one or other of the rams' horn shapes—now shown you—to purposes of collection was very ancient, and such Shophars may have been ultimately fixed in position, and as years went on and crowds of worshippers increased, larger receptacles would be made, the old shapes being followed. By and by organization brought about an increase in their number, and the allocation of each separate Shophar box to some specific branch of offerings and dues. The Shopharoth were narrow at the mouth so that a hand could not follow a coin, and were wide at the base so that considerable amounts could lodge in each of them under secure bolts or locks. This is a list of the receipts to which each trumpet was specifically set apart:—

THE SHOPHAROTH,
OR TRUMPET-SHAPED MONEY BOXES
(JERUSALEM).

LEGAL DUES.

- I.—Temple tribute (half shekel) of current year.
- II.— Do. do. (do.) of past year.
- III.—Turtle-dove money.
- IV.—Pigeon-money.
- V.—Temple-fuel-money.
- VI.—Incense-money.
- VII.—Golden-vessels money.
- VIII.—Residue-money from sin-offerings.
- IX.— Do. do. do. trespass-offerings.

VOLUNTARY GIFTS.

- X.—Residue-money from offerings of birds.
- XI.— Do. do. do. Nazarite offerings.
- XII.— Do. do. do. cleansed lepers' offerings.
- XIII.—Voluntary offerings.

I have divided this list into two categories; the first nine items being compulsory dues, the remaining four being voluntary from the legal standpoint, but none the less customary dues. Over the paying-in operations at the trumpets devoted to the nine legal dues priests personally presided, seeing that the coins put in were of correct amount, and giving each offerer a small counterfoil or token to produce hereafter in proof that he had discharged all liability. Over the four trumpets devoted to the voluntary receipts there was less need for priestly oversight, but trumpet xiii was closely watched by the crowds on festival occasions, when the rich and ostentatious poured their money into the mouth of it with a sounding rattle to be heard and seen of men.

It was the law of the temple that every sacrifice and offering due by the priestly code from any worshipper must be discharged by him at the temple at the festival next following the event, or next following his vow (as the case might be), so that at all these temple festivals at Jerusalem—especially at Passover, Pentecost, and Tabernacles, when every male must appear (and some two to three millions of people actually attended) a huge business must have been done at these offertory trumpets, and we are not surprised to read that the priests had to empty the contents several times a day.

(g) You will begin to realize how all important was the financial aspect of these ancient festivals when it is brought home to you in the case of the Jews, but all nations, and all temples, had very much the same fiscal regulations and sacred code of dues and charges, and when you have summarized what the devout Jew paid you will know pretty much what the other devout races paid, for in the details of the dues themselves there were few very important differences.

[*Period of the Second Temple at Jerusalem.*]

RELIGIOUS CONTRIBUTIONS REQUIRED FROM EVERY JEWISH LAYMAN.

1. Biccureim (first-fruits of all grain crops and fruit crops): TWO PER CENT.
 2. Terumoth (first fruits of all flour, wine, oil, vegetables, and garden produce): TWO PER CENT.
 3. Reshith (first of the fleece of wool): FIVE SHEKELS WEIGHT.
 4. Reshith Challah (first of the dough): FOUR PER CENT.
 5. Corners of the fields (for the poor): TWO PER CENT.
 6. Levitical tithe (to the Levites): TEN PER CENT.
 7. Festival tithe (for use at temple festivals; but every third year as for the poor only): TEN PER CENT.
 8. Firstlings of all animals (in kind or money).
 9. For every first-born son: FIVE SHEKELS.
 10. The temple tribute; for every male adult: HALF A SHEKEL.
- [*The above imposts would absorb at least ONE FOURTH OF ALL THE PROFITS OF AGRICULTURE, but part of this must be regarded as rent of the land due to Jahveh.*]
11. Sacrifices and offerings.
 12. Vows and vow-rates.
 13. Voluntary contributions.

All ancient peoples had to make vows frequently, during the year as to what they would do for their God if this or that happened rightly, or if deliverance came from any actual or apprehended troubles. All had to redeem these vows with sacrifice and offering at the next festival at their temple, and must attend it in order to do so. At the spring festival and harvest festival all who did not actually bring firstlings or first-fruits must commute the values into coin, and bring coin instead. By the temple tariff of Phœnicia I showed in my last lecture how great was the burden of eastern sacrificial codes, and you must recollect that every Jew had to bring frequent victims from his flock and herd, or to buy them at the temple, whilst with every such sacrifice he must also provide meat and drink offerings, and during the year must make many peace and

freewill offerings, and pay frequent dues for trespass and breaches of the Levitical law. He must often contribute to the temple offertories, to alms collected for the poor and stranger, and must show a lavish hospitality to these and others every time he appeared before Jahveh.

The sale of victims, of oil and wine, of frankincense and fuel for the altars, of skins and hides from the sacred abbatoir were, in all countries, by-products of the temple system that were richly fostered by their festivals, and we need not further labour our proofs that in every country of the ancient world the sacred treasuries were powerfully augmented by these sacred feasts and fasts.

IV.

I will now leave Palestine and address myself to ancient Greece, the land *par excellence* of temple festivals.

I will show you first the City of Athens with its famous Parthenon and noble temple of Theseus: then the graceful and exquisite remains of Athena's temple on the promontory of Sunium; and lastly the ruined but beautiful colonnades of the temple of Apollo at Bassæ.

(a) The Greek festivals have been difficult to collect into tabular form, for in the first place (like the Jewish feasts), many of them had two or three names, and to avoid duplication, reference is necessary to a great list of classical authorities. After weeding out some 52 aliases, there comes, in the second place, the task of allotting among the Greek cities some 283 festivals, laboriously gathered, of distinct and different names, and ascertaining what deity each was intended to honour. Fifty of them, for instance (such as the HERAKLEIA and HERMÆA), are stated by the Greek writers to have been generally observed throughout wide districts, but no town is cited by name save in a few isolated cases.

The compilation therefore of the table I now offer you has been a matter of patient labour, and it can only be offered, as some fairly correct embodiment of what the authorities have told us in regard to the geographical distribution of temple festivals in greater Greece; which expression includes Greece of the mainland, of the isles, of the Asiatic shore (Levant), and of the Mediterranean colonies.

GREATER GREECE.

ALLOCATION OF THE TEMPLE FESTIVALS.

				Festivals.				
* Ægæan Isles	...	...	...	93	Brought forward... 494			
Athens	...	...	...	85	OUTER GREECE—			
Sparta	...	...	...	27	† Ionia	...	...	23
Argos	...	...	...	16	‡ Sicily	...	...	19
Sicyon	...	...	...	16	§ Syria	...	...	12
Corinth	...	...	...	15	Caria	...	...	11
Delphi	...	...	...	15	Italy	...	...	10
Elis	...	...	...	12	Crete	...	...	9
Thebes	...	...	...	10	Phrygia	...	...	8
Eleusis	...	...	...	7	Phœnicia	...	...	8
Megara	...	...	...	7	Thracia	...	...	7
Orchomenus	...	...	...	7	Bithynia	...	...	6
Pellene	...	...	...	7	Lydia	...	...	5
Tegea	...	...	...	7	¶ Mysia	...	...	5
Trœzene	...	...	...	6	Pamphylia	...	...	5
Salamis	...	...	...	6	Alexandria	...	...	4
7 Towns of 4 festivals each				28	Rhodes	...	...	4
18 " 3 "				54	Cilicia	...	...	4
25 " 2 "				50	Cyprus	...	...	4
26 " 1 "				26	Cyrene	...	...	4
					Others	...	...	26
Carry forward				494	— 174			
					TOTAL 668			

* Ægina 15. Delos 12. Cos 9. Lesbos 6. Andros 5. Others 4 each.

† Ephesus 6. Magnesia 5. Smyrna 5; &c.

‡ Syracuse 9.

§ Antioch 4. Hierapolis 3; &c.

|| Neapolis 4.

¶ Pergamus 4.

[Two hundred and eighty-three festivals of different names are here dealt with, very many of them being held in more cities than one: the Olympia Mikra, for instance, in twenty-six stated places, and the Thesmophoria in twenty-seven. The seven towns of four festivals each were: Brauron, Chæronæa, Hermione, Mantinea, Patræ, Phlya and Tanagra. Those of three each were: Acræphium, Amyclæ, Andania, Caryæ, Epidaurus, Hyampolis, Ithome, Lebadæa, Megalopolis, Messene, Oropus, Pheneos, Phigalia, Platæa, Therapne, Thespiæ, and Mounts Cithæron and Lycæus. Those of two and one each are too numerous to be here cited.]

Before we pass on we will glance at the Erechtheion at Athens, the Temple of Mysteries at Eleusis, and the imposing and beautiful sanctuary of Poseidon at Corinth.

(b) Four great pilgrim festivals were common to the whole of Greece, and from every part of the Greek world men came with costly offerings to the great national temples at Delphi (Pythian Apollo), Elis (Olympian Zeus), Corinth (Isthmian Poseidon), and Nemea (Nemeian Zeus). These festivals, being triennial or quadrennial, were so arranged that one or other of them could be attended every year. To Athenians there also appealed the great pilgrim festival, the PANATHENÆA; to Ionians, the great EPHESIA at Ephesus, and PANIONIA on Mount Mycale; to Bœotians, the Itonian Athena's festival, the PAMBŒOTIA; and in later times Greece had its PANELLENIA, an institution of Emperor Hadrian. Apart also from these panegyric and amphictyonic celebrations, there were a score of other festivals attended by most Greeks who could afford to travel to them with their gifts and offerings. Of such were the magnificent pageants at Delos (Delian Apollo), Ægina (the POSEIDONIA), the HERÆA at Elis, Argos or Samos, the ASKLEPIEIA at Epidaurus, the CARNEIA at

Sparta, the mysteries of Demeter at Eleusis, the HELIAIA at Rhodes, the ISIA at Tithorea, the LAPHRIA at Patræ, and the lovely festival of the Tænarian Poseidon.

Now at all these greater festivals, attended by so many Greeks and so many thousands of foreigners, sacred fairs were held of much size and importance, at which stallage was charged for the right to erect booths, and market dues levied for the benefit of the temples concerned. Dues equivalent to gate-money were also collected on your entry into the sacred enclosure, where were held the sacred games and shows, races and other athletic contests, boxing and wrestling, gladiator combats, cock-fighting, poetical and musical competitions, dancing exhibitions, beauty competitions (male and female), sea-fights, and many torch races.

(c) Next in national interest, perhaps, I may rank the great festivals of the glorious dead; those names dear to every Greek memory, and not less to every student throughout the world: the LEONIDÆA at Thermopylæ, the PAUSANIÆ (or Eleutheria) at Platæa, the MUNYCHIA for Salamis, AGROTERA for Marathon, and BOREASMI for the scattering of Xerxes' ships. Sicyon had its great ARATEIA for him that freed Greece from Macedonia and Rome; Sparta its BRASIDEIA in patriotic memory of its champion in the Peloponnesian war. There can be no question that in all countries the temple festivals were a great national bond, binding compatriots together, quickening and inspiring their national memories and ambitions, and knitting together scattered communities in the interests of administration as well as of a common worship, even a common polytheism.

(d) All over the Greek world—wherever a temple reared its head to Apollo or Artemis—little statues (often little altars of incense without any statue) would be erected

within its Temenos to the other favourite national deities. In like manner, even in strange lands, as at Astarte's temples in Baalbec and Palmyra, these little altars or statues are found; so that in many centres Greeks celebrated with minor rites their APOLLONIA and ARTEMISIA, or their DIONYSIA or HERAKLEIA. In the rural districts of Greece itself the peasantry loved their spring THEOPHANIA and seed-time PROEROSIA festivals, their vintage EPILENÆA and OSCHOPHORIA, their harvest PYANEPSIA and THALYSIA, their flower festivals of ANTHESPHORIA and CHLOEIA in summer, and their THESMOPHORIA mysteries of Demeter in the winter.

(e) But let us examine the festival calendar of the city of Athens. Over a hundred festivals are known to have been yearly celebrated there, but I will only attempt to fix specific titles to 85 of these, the remainder were doubtless most of them ENCŒNIA of the unspecified city temples.

A few words of explanation should precede this table. As in Palestine and Italy, it was the custom of Greece to give each of her festivals a distinctive name. Not always one characteristic of its ceremonies, or embodying any patronymic of a deity: but deities had many aliases, and the majority of festival-titles did in some way or other bear allusion to the person or attributes of the being celebrated. In this list, thirty-nine of the eighty-five festivals bore the names of the divinities: eleven (such as the AGROTERA and ELAPHEBOLIA) referred to attributes of their deities: twenty were named from characteristics of the festivals themselves (HYDROPHORIA, PLYNTERIA, KYBERNESIA, APATURIA, DAPHNEPHORIA, &c.): nine from the localities of the chief temples of those specially honoured (such as the LYCÆA of Pan, the ELEUSINIA, DELPHINIA, AMARYNTHIA, &c.): whilst in six cases it is very uncertain

what the titles exactly may have meant (such as the THARGELIA and the XYNOICHIA).

THE ATHENIAN TEMPLES.

(NAMES OF EIGHTY-FIVE KNOWN FESTIVALS).

Adonia.	Delphinia.	Metageitnia.
Æora.	Demetria.	Munychia.
Agraulia.	Diasia.	Museia.
Agrotera.	Diipoleia.	Necysia.
Aianteia.	Diogeneia.	Nemeseia.
Aidonia.	Dionysia Astika.	Nephalia.
Amarynthia.	„ Mikra.	Olympia Mikra.
Amphiarara.	Dioscuria.	Oschophoria.
Amphieteria.	Ebdome.	Panathenæa.
Androgeonia.	Elaphebolia.	Pandia.
Anthesteria.	Eleusinia.	Pandrosia.
Antinoeia.	„ Mikra.	Phagesia.
Apaturia.	Epilenæa.	Plynteria.
Aphrodisia.	Eumenideia.	Poseidonia.
Artemisia.	Eurygyeia.	Proerosia.
Asklepieia.	Galaxia.	Prometheia.
Bendideia.	Gamelia.	Pyanepsia.
Boedromia.	Hecatesia.	Scira.
Boreasmi.	Hephæstæa.	Scirophoria.
Brauronia.	Heræa.	Soteria.
Cabeiria.	Herakleia.	Thalysia.
Chalceia.	Hermæa.	Thargelia.
Chalcioicia.	Hydrophoria.	Theoxenia.
Charitesia.	Inoa.	Theseia.
Chloeia.	Iolaia.	Thesmophoria.
Cotyttia.	Kybernesia.	Tonea.
Cronia.	Lenæa.	Trieterica.
Daphnephoria.	Lycæa (P.)	Xynoikia.
Delia (Return from).		

(f) The relative popularity of deities among the Athenians may be gauged to a fair extent by the number of their yearly feasts. It will be seen from the following table the greater part of these were single celebrations to single

deities or heroes, such festivals being probably all held on dedication anniversaries of the temples so concerned.

THE ATHENIAN FESTIVALS.

(DEITIES AND HEROES HONOURED).

Apollo	...	...	20	Demeter	...	...	6
Theseus	..	...	12	Zeus	...	...	4
Dionysos	...	...	9	Hera	...	...	3
Athena	...	...	8	Herakles	...	...	2
Artemis		...	7	Androgeos	...	...	2

(ONE FESTIVAL EACH).

Adonis.	Boreas.	Icarius.	Poseidon.
Agraulos.	Cotys.	Ino.	Prometheus.
Ajax.	Cronos.	Mnemosyne.	The Cabiri.
Amphiaraus.	Demetrius.	Nausithous.	The Dead.
Antinous.	Diogenes.	Nemesis.	The Dioscuri.
Aphrodite.	Hecate.	Pan.	The Furies.
Asklepios.	Hephæstos.	Pandrosos.	The Graces.
Bendis.	Hermes.	Plouton.	The Muses.

(g) Athens had its New Moon festivals monthly (HECATESIA): its Oracle festivals (AMPHIARAIA, DELPHINIA, &c.): its festivals of the Dead (NECYSIA and others): its festival of City-Gods (DIPOLEIA), and its Adolescence festivals (AGRAULIA, APATURIA, &c.) The Attic lunar year of 354 days was essentially different to the Spartan, and that again to the Bœotian, or the Ionian, or the Cretan: and, until the period of Hadrian, both the names and duration of Greek months were well mixed up. The Athenian year began with the summer solstice (July), the Spartan with the autumnal equinox (October), the Bœotian with the winter solstice (January), and the Delphic, Bithynian, and Cyprian with the month of September, so there was sufficient variety. The Athenian leap-year arrangement differed materially from that we noticed in Jerusalem:

intercalary months being inserted into every third, fifth, and eighth year, thus creating a solar octennium (or Enneæteris as it was termed).

ATHENS: FESTIVAL HOLIDAYS.

(LUNAR CALENDAR).

				Holidays.		Work-Days.		Total.
Hecatombæon	...	...		21	...	9	...	30
Metageitnion	...	...		16	...	13	...	29
Boedromion	...	...		21	...	9	...	30
Pyanepsion	...	...		18	...	11	...	29
Maimacterion	...	...		13	...	17	...	30
Poseideon	...	...		14	...	15	...	29
Gamelion	...	...		13	...	17	...	30
Anthesterion	...	...		16	...	13	...	29
Elaphebolion	...	...		16	...	14	...	30
Munychion	...	...		13	...	16	...	29
Thargelion	...	...		17	...	13	...	30
Skirophorion	...	...		10	...	19	...	29
				188		166		354
(Allow for)								
19 days of Triennial	}	Feasts	...	5		5		
Quadrennial								
(or) Quinquennial								
				193		161		
Festivals not Calendared	...	12	}	...	46		46	
Apophrades Hemeraï...	...	34						
				239		115		
Ebdome	...	...	...	...	On seventh day after every birth.			
Gamelia	...	...	...	...	{	On every Marriage celebration.		
						On each Birthday recurrence.		
Public or Private Rites	...	...	...	...	On every Death anniversary.			

The above calendar for an ordinary lunar year serves to show the order of the Attic months and duration of the compulsory holidays. It will be noted that alternate months were of 30 days and 29 days, that the Apophrades

Hemerai (two or three at end of each month) were to some extent like the Hebrew sabbaths, and that the private festal observances at foot of the list must have added considerably to the days of absence from ordinary employment.

(h) The Mystery festivals throughout Greece and Outer Greece were of immense popularity. At Eleusis, in the autumn, 30,000 people marched in the procession from Athens, singing hymns, and afterwards went by night with torches to the Temple of Demeter and the Maid, remaining in its subterranean chambers until morning under terror and affright whilst the sacred tragedies were enacted before them, and each worshipper took the full degree after a previous year's initiation to these mysteries. The revenues of this temple from initiation fees and degree fees were prodigious, and many devout Greeks took further festival degrees in the other sacred mysteries that abounded all over the land. For instance, there were the THESMOPHORIA of Demeter and Persephone, the CABEIRIA for the Pelasgic Cubiri, the CYBELEIA for the Asiatic Cybele, the ISIA for the Egyptian Isis, the TRIETERICA and IOBAKCHEIA of Dionysos, the APHRODISIA of Aphrodite, the CORYBANTICA of Zeus, the COTYTIA of Cotys, the DRYOPEIA of Dryops, the HECATEIA of Hecate, as well as the night mysteries at the ISTHμία, KORAGIA, LERNÆA, MYSIA, NUKTELIA, and other festivals, and the AGRAULIA at Athens for the initiation of youths at puberty.

(i) Then the oracle-opening festivals, with their rich financial results to the temple treasuries. Who in all the Greek world, male or female, rich or poor, had not consulted one or more of these world-famed oracles? From all other lands, people speaking every tongue of the civilized and semi-civilized nations came with their offerings and fees to ask questions and obtain priestly

advice through the various channels of imposture adopted at the different shrines. At Delphi, with its virgin-priestess as we here see her on her tripod over the steaming fissure in the rock, Apollo inspired an endless series of badly constructed verses in answer to his questioners. Frequently, the reply took years to think out, and then proved ambiguous and worthless. At all the oracle shrines few ever got value for their money. But when did people ever care for money or sense when excited by religious superstition? It was the business of the temples to exploit every weakness and instinct of humanity for the repletion of their coffers, and the French artist who has in this picture penetrated for us the mystery of Dodona's talking oak and clanking kettles and chains and oracular dove-cooings has in no way exaggerated the fraudulent humbug of these priests and priestesses of Zeus, father of the gods. The oracle festivals were everywhere thronged with worshippers to consult one or other of the deities shown on my list on next page.

According to your means, you might consult a cheap oracle or an expensive one.

For instance, that of Amphilocheus (at Mallos) would cost you only 2½d. (2 obols), but his father, Amphiaras (at Oropus) charged 1s. (9 obols), and his grandfather, Apollo (at Delphi), required the most costly presents of any oracle in the world before you could consult him. Trophonius (at Lebadeia) was a very popular oracle, and there the charge was one silver coin and 8s. worth of cakes (10 drachmæ). The revelation has come down to us of the trial of a Greek impostor called Alexander of Abnoteichos, who ran a sham oracle—if any oracle could be more sham than another. This man, Alexander, for some years made £3,250 a year (80,000 drachmæ) by a

GREEK ORACLES.

APOLLO.	DEMETER.	PHRIXUS.
Delphi.	Patræ.	Caucasus.
Abæ.	HERMES.	THE DEAD.
Mt. Ptoon.	Pharæ.	Aornos (Lake).
Ismenion.	Smyrna.	Heraclea.
Hysie.	PLUTO AND CORA.	Phigalia.
Tegyra.	Acharaca.	Tænarus.
Eutresis,	THEMIS.	MOPSUS.
Orobiaë.	Attica.	Malia.
Argos (2).	INO.	CALCHAS.
Branchidæ.	Oetylon.	Daunia.
Claros.	Epidaurus Limera.	ASKLEPIOS.
Grynea.	AMPHIARAUS.	Cos.
Lesbos.	Potniæ.	Epidaurus,
Abdera.	Oropus.	and nearly 100
Delos.	Psaphis.	other shrines.
Patara.	Thebes.	HERAKLES.
Telmessus.	APHRODITE.	Bura.
Mallos.	Paphos.	Hyettus.
Seleucia.	DIONYSOS.	UNKNOWN.
Hybla.	Amphiclæ.	Chaonia.
Hiera Kome.	Satræ.	NERYLLINUS.
Apollonia.	GAIA.	Troad.
Miletus.	Ægira.	The NYMPHS.
Adrastia.	HERA ACRÆA.	Mt. Cithæron.
Tenedos.	Page.	ODYSSEUS.
Cyrrha.	HERMITHEA.	Ætolia.
Chalcedon.	Castabos.	PAN.
Cyanæa.	AMPHILOCHUS.	Paneas.
Daphne (Antioch).	Mallos.	Troezen.
Methymna.	TROPHONIUS.	POSEIDON HIPPIOS.
Smyrna.	Lebadeia.	Onchestus.
Thebes.	TIRESIAS.	PROTESILAUS.
Zelea.	Orchomenos.	Elæus.
ZEUS.	PASIPHÆ.	PROTEUS.
Olympia.	Thalamie.	Parium.
Dodona.		

charge of 1s. 1d. per consultation (1 drachma and 2 obols).

By far the greatest of the oracle festivals of Greece were those at Delphi, and the dream oracles of Asklepios at Epidauros, and the Næa festival oracle in the oak grove at Dodona. The Apollonia festivals all over Greece (with Apollo's oracles) were specially popular, and so were the oracle festivals of Trophonius and Ino and Amphiaraus.

(j) But a revenue equal to anything made from oracles at the temple festivals was that brought in by the sacred diviners or fortune-tellers and sooth-sayers. You did not need to go to an oracle festival for these, they were at all the festivals throughout Greece, and Rome, and Asia, and Egypt, their services being given at popular prices, and everybody consulting them upon every conceivable subject. If the diviners were priests or officials of the temples their stalls were erected in the sacred enclosure, or—as often was the case—they were ensconced in the temple itself, official fees being paid into the treasury for all answers to enquiries. If the diviners were unofficial, the temple charged a high rent to them for permission to erect their stalls near some sacred well or grotto in the vicinity, or for allowing them to put up a booth in the sacred fair on festival days. The enormous popularity of these diviners is described to us by many of the classical writers, and their practices were apparently of great variety. I have culled from the Greek and Roman writers no less than thirty-five different modes of divination for which fees were charged, and have tabulated them here for you. The examination and description of these methods, however, and of oracle methods generally, would involve at least a whole evening of your time, so with some regret I leave this subject and pass on.

GREEK AND ROMAN FESTIVALS.

LIST OF THE METHODS OF DIVINATION (35).

Aedah Arrows.	Catoptromancy.	Ignispicium.
Æromancy.	Ceromancy.	Lecanomancy.
Alectryomancy.	Cheirumancy.	Libanomancy.
Aleuromancy.	Cleromancy.	Lithomancy.
Alphitomancy.	Crystallomancy.	Molybdomancy.
Crithomancy.	Cupellomancy.	Œuomancy.
Apotelesmata.	Dactylomancy.	Oneiromancy.
Astragalomancy.	Gastromancy.	Onychomancy.
Augurium.	Geomancy.	Ophiomancy.
Axinomancy.	Haruspicina.	Ornithomancy.
Beryllomancy.	Hieromancy.	Pegomancy.
Botanomancy.	Hydromancy.	Sideromancy.
Capnomancy.		

(k) The general features of the temple festivals of Greece and Rome were much alike, but the spirit of the two peoples essentially different. The Greek put life and sparkle into the whole proceedings; the Roman was more solemn and stately and formal. I cannot give you pictures for—with the exception of Sir Frederick Leighton's beautiful *DAPHNEPHORIA* (here produced by courteous permission of the owners of the copyright)—they are simply not to be had. I can only give you some faint idea of what Greek and Roman festivals were like by going over this table:—

GREECE AND ROME.

GENERAL FEATURES OF THE PUBLIC RELIGIOUS FESTIVALS.

1. Purifications at temple and at the sacred waters.
2. Martial solemnities.
3. Processions to the temple.
4. Payment of temple dues.
5. Sacrificial formalities.
6. Special rites and ceremonies.
7. Initiation to the mysteries.
8. Games, competitions, and shows.
9. Feasting and merriment.
10. Night orgies.
11. Casual customs and observances.

There were purifications to be made and paid for, purifications for every conceivable thing. By payment, by sacrifice, by ablution you got purified from any crime you liked to name. By tariff-fines and offerings, as well as by sacrifices and ablutions, you got rid of mere offences and trespasses. By temple fees and purgings, and sometimes burnings, you got cleansed from defilements of a thousand kinds. By more fees and offerings, and more ablutions, you became clean from mere ceremonial uncleannesses, such as were involved by births, marriages and deaths, contact with the unclean or the sick or the wounded.

There were military spectacles of the utmost grandeur, for all male citizens of full age had generally to appear armed as for war; horse and foot in array joining the festival procession.

The processions themselves are of indescribable magnificence. Senators, priests, magistrates, delegates from foreign lands, all robed in white, as a rule, but often appearing in costly and splendid apparel. Little girls of five to ten, in crocus coloured robes, the maidens of the city and neighbourhood in white, with their hair down, and each carrying a basket of flowers on her head. The priestess of Artemis in a white wicker chariot drawn by white stags. The high priestess of Hera in a golden chariot drawn by four white oxen, and followed by the immense number of white-robed women, all in ranks, from the highest-born to the poorest. Trained choirs of youths and maidens sing and respond, or lead the choral movements as each division of the cavalcade proceeds, and few in the multitude of marching worshippers are without their gifts and offerings to leave at the temple when they arrive. Then follow the payments of dues at the temple, the sacrifice and formalities, and there are special rites and

cereemonies at each particular festival to be carefully observed.

Every class and every age had its special festival. Babies were carried to the APATURIA, boy babies to the TITHENIDIA; boys patronized the HERMÆA, older youths the AGRAULIA; Sparta had its world-famed and crowded festival GYMNOPÆDIA, where all the world went to see the Spartan youths march naked in ranks through the city, then box and wrestle, in commemoration of the victory at Thyrea. School children had the MUSEIA and ARATEIA; little girls the BRAURONIA; maidens the CARYA and several CANEPHORIA festivals. Artisans had the CHALCEIA; fishermen the LIMNATIDIA: musicians the ITHOMAIA; hunters and sportsmen the LAPHRIA; and so on, and so on.

(l) The festivals produced so large a number of days on which no business was done, that law suits became exceedingly protracted, unless accelerated by bribery; so bribery was carried on in Athens in the most open and systematic manner.

The expense of Athenian festivals constantly increased as they grew more sumptuous and splendid from year to year. In Solon's time they were three talents each; in Lysias's time nine talents = £2,190 (which, in 1907, would amount to more like £6,590). Wealthy citizens were burdened with a compulsory liturgy to defray the expenses of the Choregia and Gymnasiarchy, but this only gave the rein to more extravagance. By and by the cost of all sacrifices was placed upon the public taxes, and the artisans and peasants and labourers actually received state wages for attending the shows. Plutarch tells us that it was the crushing expense of these constant festivals that compelled Athens to tax her colonies and impose the Phoros upon her allies. Burdens continued to accumulate until colonies rebelled and allies forsook her and leagued

with her enemies. Nevertheless (as Boeckh has admitted), the general participation of all citizens in these festivals had a powerful influence in awakening and improving public taste. The public games and competitions connected with them helped to form the national mind and spirit, and the great expenditure upon the fine arts, in connection with displays and processions and costly offerings of statues and paintings, etc., upon ornaments for the temples, upon musical entertainments, and upon the national theatres, brought forward all men of artistic talent, and strikingly elevated the standard of taste among the richest class, whilst encouraging them to please and pauperize the mass of the people with endless free displays.

(*m*) I have purposely omitted mention of the many festivals in Asiatic Greece (and later, too, many on the mainland and in the Ægean Isles), where sensual and degrading indulgence of every kind was fostered for the benefit of the temple revenues. The worship of Aphrodite, innocent enough in itself, and in its surroundings stimulative to the national love of beauty of feature, form and outline, the national proficiency in sculpture, and aptitude for poetry and grace of expression, and love of feminine charm and sweetness (we should do well to remember that Greek girls were well looked after, and much better watched over than most of those in our great towns), degenerated into proneness to orgiastic indulgences. The worship of Dionysos, originally the rude but jovial vineyard festival at gathering of the grapes, and the vintage festival at bringing in the casked wine of the year, degenerated with equal rapidity into orgies of drunkenness and foul debauchery, like the Saturnalia and Bacchanalia of Rome, illustrated in the great picture before you. But this was the seamy side of Greek festival life, fostered

by a corrupt priesthood as the nation advanced in wealth and luxury. I would rather reflect upon all that Greece has taught the world in refinement of manners, in noble purity of patriotism, in deathless services to art and literature, and in passing from Athens to Rome, one always does so with regret, as I do now.

V.

We will now look at the City of Rome and its ruined Forum, then at some of the Roman temples: this of Saturn, and this of Jupiter Capitolinus, and that of Vesta.

(a) The Roman people took their festivals somewhat more seriously than the Greeks, and there were plenty of temple festivals in Rome as my table on next page shows.

(b) It is easier to compile this Roman list and to make out the festival calendar. A formal nation, they committed their public decrees to stone and metal (worn or broken fragments of their sacred calendar having actually come down to us), and the admirable little work of Mr. Warde Fowler on the *Roman Festivals at the period of the Republic* has enabled me to complete the information given by previous writers, and draw up this fairly accurate table of the festive holidays in Rome.

The Roman year began with March, and that month (as its name shows) was consecrated to the god of war. The lunar calendar was framed or reformed by NUMA from the older Romulian calendar. Julius Cæsar, much later on, reformed it again, and, whilst making the year ten days longer, he took the opportunity to name one of its months after himself. Quinctilis, the fifth month, became Julius (or July), an example followed by the next Roman Emperor, who, when further tinkering with the calendar, took Sextilis, the sixth month, and made it Augustus, to

TEMPLE FESTIVALS.—ROME.

NAMES OF 121 KNOWN FESTIVALS.

Æsculapius.	Fortuna (Publica).	Paganalia.
Allia.	„ (Virilis).	Parilia.
Ambarvalia.	Foundation of Rome.	Parentalia.
Ancillarum Feriæ.	Furrinalia.	Perennalia.
Ancyliæ.	Hercules.	Pietas.
Apollinares Ludi.	Hilaria.	Poplifugia.
Argeorum Sacra.	Ides.	Portunalia.
Armilustrinum.	Isia.	Probatio Equorum.
Bacchanalia.	Janus.	Quinquatria.
Bellona.	Juno.	Quinquatrus Minusculæ.
Bona Dea.	„ Curitis.	Quirinalia.
Brumalia.	„ Moneta.	Regifugium.
Caprotinæ.	„ Sospita.	Robigalia.
Carmentalia.	Jupiter.	Salus.
Carnalia.	„ Fulgur.	Saturnalia.
Castor and Pollux.	Juturnalia.	Sementivæ (Feriæ).
Cerealia.	Kalends.	Septimontium.
Compitalia.	Larentalia.	Sol Indiges.
Concordia.	Lares Præstites.	Spes.
Consualia.	Latinæ (Feriæ).	Stultorum Feriæ.
Diana.	Lemuria.	Summanus.
Dius Fidius.	Liberalia.	Tellus and Ceres.
Divalia.	Lucaria.	Terminalia.
Ecalesia.	Ludi Plebei.	Tiberinus.
Epulum Jovi.	„ Romani.	Tubilustrinum.
Equirria.	Luna.	Vediovis.
Equus ad Nixas.	Lupercalia.	Veneralia.
Faunalia.	Magna Mater.	Venus Erycina.
Feralia.	Mamuralia.	Vestalia.
Feronalia.	Marti (Feriæ).	Vinalia.
Fides.	Matralia.	„ Rustica.
Floralia.	Matronalia.	Vitulatio.
Fontinalia.	Meditrinalia.	Volcanalia.
Fordicidia.	Megalesia.	Volturnalia.
Fornacalia.	Mens.	Vortumnalia.
Fortuna.	Mercurius and Maia.	
„ (Fors).	Minervalia.	SPECIAL
„ (Hujusce Diei).	Monetalis.	Aquiliciana.
„ (Muliebris)	Neptunalia.	Augustales Ludi.
„ (Præneste).	Opalia.	Novendiale Sacrum
„ (Primigenia).	Opi-Consivia.	Tarentini Ludi.

perpetuate his own name. The intercalary day for leap year had to be rectified at a still later period, under Pope Gregory; but, following the Roman order (February being the last month of the year), the leap year day was still kept at the end of February, though that month had become the second month of the year.

ROME: HOLIDAYS AND WORK-DAYS.

(LUNAR CALENDAR).

	Holidays.		Work-days.	Total.
	Compulsory.	Customary.		
Martius.....	10	7	14	31
Aprilis	21	6	2	29
Malus	7	5	19	31
Junius	11	4	14	29
Quinctilis	15	9	7	31
Sextilis	10	4	15	29
September	3	18	8	29
October.....	7	1	23	31
November	2	17	10	29
December.....	10	6	13	29
Januarius	6	8	15	29
Februarius	22	3	3	28
(117 festivals included)	—	—	—	—
121 recorded.	124	88		
Republican Calendar	212		143	355
Julian Calendar	126		239	365
Augustan	185		180	
Marcus Antoninus	135		230	
Compare London (1907).....	86		279	365
Feræ Privatæ: Denicales.			Feræ Publicæ: Stativæ.	
Familiarum.			Conceptivæ.	
Natalis.			Imperativæ.	
			Præcidanæ.	

(c) With the Romans, Juno was honoured by a festival on the first day of every new moon, and Jupiter at every day of full moon (13th or 15th of each month).

The seed-time festival was the *FERIÆ SEMENTIVÆ*; the spring equinox festival was the *HILARIA*; the harvest and vintage festivals the *MEDITRINALIA* and *VINALIA*; the winter equinox festival the *COMPITALIA*; and the festivals of the dead were the *FERALIA* and *PARENTALIA*.

The festivals of adolescence in Rome were: for maidens, the *BONA DEA*, on 1st May, and for youths, the *LIBERALIA*, on 17th March. The *Bona Dea* was one of three great flower festivals in Rome, and the vestals conducted all the ceremonies, which were for women only. They included a dancing and drinking orgie at night, however, which the vestals did not attend. The *Liberalia* opened with sacrifices, after which the priests and priestesses of Bacchus marched through the city in procession, wearing ivy garlands, and carrying a portable altar and fire-pan, around which—as they marched—they dispensed wine, honey, cakes, and sweets; whilst the initiated youths, now wearing for the first time the *toga virilis*, marched in front of the cavalcade, and during that day the slaves of Rome had holiday.

The river festival of the Tiber (*VOLTURNALIA*) was on 27th August, and at the winter solstice (third week of December) came the *SATURNALIA* festival of ancient standing, still perpetuated in the carnival of Rome. At the *Saturnalia*, slaves were banqueted and waited upon all day by their masters, children had presents of toys given them, and everyone received and gave presents to everyone; this custom having come down to us at Christmas through the Romans. At dusk every dwelling was lit up with wax candles, like Christmas trees are, and all day for three days the rural peasants, free from their toils, crowded into Rome to see the sights.

(d) The oracle-opening festivals were not so numerous in Italy as in Greece, but were all splendidly patronised.

ITALIAN AND SICILIAN ORACLES.

CALCHAS.	FORTUNA.
Mount Drion.	Præneste.
CERES.	MARS.
Crotona.	Tiora Mattiene.
SERAPIS.	Reate.
Rome.	PODALIRIUS.
ÆSCULAPIUS.	Mount Drion.
Rome.	THE PALISCI.
FAUNUS.	Sicily.
Albunea.	UNKNOWN DEITY.
Tibur.	Aponus (Patavium).
Aventine Hill.	Cære.
FORTUNA.	Folerii.
Antium (Volscian).	

(e) Diviners and sorcerers swarmed all over the country, their booths and travelling paraphernalia being as common as our Austrian pianos, but far more profitable to the owners, who in most cases were under temple patronage, and divided profits with the sacred treasuries. At the QUINQUATRIA festival on 19th March (Minerva's day), every woman in Rome went to consult the diviners and fortune tellers.

(f) The duration of the Roman festivals was constantly extending from one or two days each to five or six, and festivals by and by came to overlap one another in a rather confusing way.

In the month of March, for instance, three festivals take place together on the first day, three on the 14th, two on the 15th, two on the 17th, three on the 19th, and two on the 23rd; this is a fair sample of all the other months.

As to length of sacred holidays. In April alone the MEGALESIA took seven days, the LUDI CEREALES eight days, and the FERIE LATINÆ six days, which soon grew to fifteen. There were other festivals in April as well, and at the

period of the republic there were actually but two days in that month when men were supposed to be allowed to do any work. February was as bad. The PARENTALIA took up nine days of this shortest month, the NEFASTI (or unlucky days) took up thirteen more, and the FAUNALIA, LUPERCALIA, QUIRINALIA, FORNACALIA, FERALIA, TERMINALIA, REGIFUGIUM, and EQUIRRIA a day each, leaving only three days free for attending to business and professions. Of course, all months were not like these. You could work for nineteen days in May for instance, and twenty-three days in October. But in November the LUDI PLEBEII took seventeen days out of the twenty-nine, and in September the LUDI ROMANI took twenty days. This for festivals that were in no way sacred to the gods, and we see thus that the Romans deliberately preferred not to work if they could make an excuse for holidays. I know some people in Lancashire that are a good deal like them.

The greatest festival gatherings at Rome were the FERIE LATINÆ and the MEGALESIA. On these the expenditure grew so enormous that the senate prohibited future outlays beyond a fixed but fairly high amount.

(9) The VESTALIA festival took place on the 9th to the 15th June, during which seven days every lady of good family and virtuous reputation in Rome walked barefoot in daily processions to the temple of Vesta on the Capitoline hill: the abode of the Vestals. My picture shows the interior of that temple and the election of one of its virgin priestesses.

At the NEPTUNALIA, on 23rd July, everybody in Rome built booths of branches and leaves (like Jews at the feast of tabernacles, and Greeks and Egyptians at some of their festivals) and lived in them all day, feasting and rejoicing.

School children had their great Processional festival, the MINERVALIA. Labourers had theirs, the VACUNÆ.

Peasants had the rural FAUNALIA. Shepherds their PALILIA and LUPERCALIA. The woodcutters and the sportsmen had their festival of the forest, the NEMORALIA, and the merchants held their festival at the Temple of Mercury, the god of successful cunning.

First fruits were paid at the AMBARVALIA festival of Ceres in May, and tithes were brought in at the festival of HERCULES, including the tithes paid by Romans on their business profits, and the tithes of booty paid by soldiers, and the tithes on windfalls paid by everybody who had chance good luck.

Great military processions took place at the ARMILUSTRIUM festival of Mars in November, when every citizen appeared in arms, and at the FERIE LATINÆ and LUDI APOLLINARES. At the last named festival a collection was taken from everybody in the Circus Maximus towards defraying the expenses, as it was a very costly pageant indeed.

At the festival of Juno Lucina (the Matronalia) on 1st March, every mother in Rome, from the Empress to the poorest plebeian's wife, or the slave, went in procession to offer sacrifices, and as they emerged from the temple every woman received a present from her husband, whilst every girl in the city that had a lover received from him a gift before the day closed, and every female slave was feasted by her mistress.

Servant girls had a great time on 7th July, when the CAPROTINÆ was held, and romped about the city all day dressed in their mistresses' clothes, being free by edict to beat each other, throw stones at each other, and scoff at every passer-by. Mothers with little babies never omitted on 1st June to attend the CARNALIA with an offering of beans and bacon, in return for which the goddess Carna protected their little ones from vampires.

The second and third weeks in April were a great time for all the ladies and girls of good family, for they had a glorious festival of their own, the CEREALIA, and spent heaps of money, whilst their husbands were forced by the state to pay the entire bill to whatever it might amount. They wore white clothes for twelve days, and allowed none to come as spectators to the colosseum who would not also wear white clothes. That vast circus was filled day by day with these white-robed audiences. The daily processions of women and girls in white were splendid beyond description, and the girls' torch races at night through the city were the great feature of the festival from the male point of view. To wind up the Cerealia, the women held the mysteries of Ceres, and every year they killed with impunity several women and girls who were found venturing in without previous initiation.

At the VOLCANALIA, on 23rd August, people went with live fishes to throw into the altar fires of Vulcan, and when they had made their offerings, and done this, were allowed to use lighted candles in their houses thenceforward through the coming dark evenings.

At the CONSUALIA, on 21st August and 15th December, all the horses of Rome had a holiday, and went decked with garlands to the Temple of Consus, where a great festival sacrifice took place, and libations were poured for every horse in attendance.

A strange festival was that of the DIANÆ in AVENTINO on 13th August, the slaves' holiday festival of Diana. The Latin historians, frequently men of deficient humour, tell us this day the Roman women washed their heads, and discussions have thereupon arisen as to the personal habits of the ladies of Rome. Probably all that is meant is that in the absence of their women-slaves the ladies had to wash their own heads that day, or it may mean that such

of them as had a vow (and dare not wash until it had been performed) were allowed to wash their heads on this date, vow or no vow.

At the **FLORALIA** everybody wore garlands of flowers, and watched the merry games and shows, and many drank till respectability disappeared. Then the theatres were opened, and the populace enjoyed for one night of the year the remarkable exhibition of comedies and tragedies by stark-naked actresses.

At the **FORNACALIA**, the festival of the god of ovens, men went to join the solemn pageant attended by all the curiæ with their banners and insignia, and every family in the city baked oven-cakes and offered them to Fornax that their loaves might not be burnt during the coming twelve months.

At the **HILARIA**, on 25th March, a great and solemn procession bore Cybele's statue through Rome, and before it went all the most costly and beautiful works of art in Rome—a free exhibition for the people—then followed games and amusements, with a general masquerade at night.

At the **LEMURIA**, on the 10th day of May, all the temples closed, and no marriages were allowed, this being the day when Romulus murdered his brother, Remus. Everybody went at night to take part in a barefoot procession in perfect silence through the streets, stopping at one point to wash hands three times, then at another point to wash them nine times, and every now and then all these serious, grown-up citizens threw black beans over their left shoulders, with silent exorcisms against the evil spirits supposed to be behind them on the march.

And now, ladies and gentlemen, I think you have heard enough of temple festivals to last you for a bit.

The days of pageants were the great days of Greece and Rome, but the love of pageants still lies deep in the nature of man, and we in Liverpool are beginning to wake up to some of its national and civic advantages. To keep clear of profligate extravagance on these occasions is pretty easy, one would think; to keep clear of grovelling features in connection with them is easier for us than it was for states 1,800 years ago. To emulate the noble standards of Greek taste and beauty should be our task in all our civic displays, and to regard these things in all solemnity—as did the Romans—as part of the machinery by which a nation may be imbued with undying regard for its own past achievements and its own dead heroes. These things we may strive for, not forgetting those greater ideals: love of simplicity, and purity, and unselfishness, and true manliness.

METAPHYSICS OF A BUSINESS MAN.

By RICHARD STEEL.

I HAVE received so much indulgence from the Literary and Philosophical Society of Liverpool, before whom I have in past years read contributions, some of which were of a quasi-philosophical character, that I now venture to inflict upon it the present paper, which is so far relevant to those previous essays that it gives to them a philosophical basis more definite than is fully expressed in any one of them. Taken in connection with a paper read by me in 1881, entitled "The Philosophy of the Probable," it indicates a line of thought which has been much present with me; and, insignificant as the operations of an individual mind must necessarily be, it nevertheless represents a strand or filament of abstract thought which has interwoven itself amongst the activities of an ordinary business career, and which, so far as I am aware, possesses at any rate the somewhat questionable value of being original.

Some explanation is due as regards the title of my paper. It may perhaps have occurred to you that it would be more natural and appropriate for a self-styled business man to deal with ethics rather than with metaphysics, inasmuch as sundry animadversions upon commercial conduct which have from time to time been put forward in the press, and even by more reverend critics, upon business methods, might be held to indicate that the

ethics of the business world are of a variable quality, conforming often to a lowered and somewhat reduced standard of morality, and thus a suitable subject for investigation. Such an assumption, however, would be entirely wrong. I believe that the standard of right in most business circles is as high as is to be found in any other of the channels in which the tide of human activity flows: and that there is no more proportionate admixture of irregularity of conduct emanating from individuals upon the exchanges of the world than is to be found in any of the professional and other occupations of mankind.

My actual motive in referring to the business man in our title is easily stated. It is not given to those who are occupied with little intermission in active business to be at all thoroughly versed in the literature of a subject which has given rise to a great number of able and learned works, any one of which, if full justice were done to it, would require careful, protracted, and engrossing study. So that the matter which will be put before you to-night will not carry with it such a degree of sanction or authority as might reasonably be accorded to a thorough and devoted study of the opinions and theories of the great writers. It is true that I have read, or partially read, some part of that which has appeared in standard works upon metaphysics, but it is to be feared that even so much of the small erudition which has thus accrued to me might be looked upon as good seed which has fallen upon stony ground and borne little fruit. But, *per contra*, as an accountant would say, I possess the advantage of being entirely untrammelled by the prepossessions of the really erudite, and am able to present my views without bias or restraint, and with that convenient sort of impartiality which results from not knowing *too* much of the conflicting opinions of other theorists.

And now to our subject. What is metaphysic, or if we use the plural but equivalent term, what are metaphysics? You all know the humorous definition which has been given. When anybody talks to you about something you do not understand, about something he does not understand, that is metaphysics. But this is far too general a description, and would apply fairly well to very many subjects of conversation and dissertation. Metaphysic really is the science which deals with the fundamental questions of knowledge and being, acquiring thus two principal divisions which modern philosophers discriminate under the extremely uninviting titles of Epistemology and Ontology.

Repulsive though this may appear on the surface, we do nevertheless all of us, as a matter of fact, have our metaphysical meditations at times. Like Molière's well-known character who had been talking prose all his life without being aware of it, so some of us have perhaps not been clearly aware that we too have from time to time been and become again metaphysicians. But the fact remains. You will remember the great generalization of the philosopher Comte, that the sciences and human thought generally have passed, and are passing by a natural evolution, through three stages—the theological, the metaphysical, and the positive—this last superseding, and being destined to supersede its antecedents. In this matter, that which is perhaps true of the race is certainly true of the individual. Just as it is accepted under Haeckel's law, that in physical evolution, the embryonic history of the individual is a repetition of the race history of the chain of life antecedent to it, so in the intellectual world also does the individual mind pass through the same series of phases as that of the general or collective mind of the race to which he belongs. The

only qualification with regard to the phases of thought referred to, which I must put in, is that, at no time, in my opinion, does any of them cease to operate, but that they vary in the order suggested in their relative potency.

It is thus a mistake to suppose that men generally have an actual and real distaste for metaphysics. The term may sometimes arouse tedious and unsatisfactory associations, but, as a matter of fact, there is probably no thinking unit of mature age who has not, of his or her own initiative, indulged in metaphysical speculation. The phenomena of "being," of an individual consciousness, floating perhaps in a vast and illimitable ocean of consciousness outside of itself; the questions: "What is the world of things we know?" and "How do we know it?" must have at some time or other flitted across the mind in its leisure and contemplative moments with a sense of wonder and puzzlement, and it is these very considerations and questions, with the answers and theories which have been framed in regard to them, which constitute the main body of the old but ever new subject with which we are dealing.

The field of thought involved is clear and open to everyone, so that even those of us who have been occupied for the whole of our adult lives with prosaic affairs of various kinds may reason out our own metaphysics without much danger of trespassing in any nefarious sense upon domains already walled in and appropriated by a prescriptive right of successful reasoning.

Encouraged by this consideration, let us try to frame our own views in detail upon the foundation matter of metaphysics, or, as some would call it, philosophy in the strict modern sense of the latter word.

FIRST PROPOSITION.

The foundation of all human knowledge consists necessarily in the simple fact of which each human being is possessed—of his or her own individual existence. One well-known statement embodying this fact is the dictum of Descartes, *cogito ergo sum* (I think, therefore I am), and Augustine, some time Bishop of Hippo, had already laid down an equivalent proposition in other words.

This idea, as we may term it provisionally, ought always to be the starting point of any theory and systemization of philosophical knowledge. "I am," is a dictum of consciousness about which there can be no doubt whatever in consciousness, for personal existence and consciousness are correlative terms, the first of which implies the second, and the second of which postulates and implies the first.

Most persons, whether abstruse thinkers or not, will admit the proposition as stated by Descartes, but this acquiescence on their part does not necessarily prove its certainty. But I think that the following considerations may be held to accomplish this further end, even to the most fastidious and rigid reasoners. There have been thinkers who would say that, as the contradictory supposition to that of the Descartes formula, *i.e.*, the supposition of the *non*-existence of the thinking and conscious being—is inconceivable, that so it cannot be true, and that, therefore, the prime supposition or formula, as enunciated by Descartes, must be true. But this is not sound reasoning. Inconceivability is not an adequate ground to go upon for the absolute rejection of every inconceivable statement, inasmuch as to use such a criterion is to make the capacity of human judgment and conception the measure of truth. To sustain the truth of a proposition by denial

of its contradictory it must rather be shown that the contradictory is impossible. Now the full contradictory of Descartes' dictum would be to say, either "I think, but I do not exist," or to say, "I exist, but I do not think;" but the contradictory alternative thus exhibited is in each case clearly impossible. In its second form it is self destructive, for the expression used is itself obviously a thought, and to assert it is therefore to assert that "I think," and "I do not think," at the same time. In the first form, the alternative is equally impossible, for "I think" asserts a fact, the existence of the "I" or "ego," and to couple that fact up with the remainder of the assertion is to say that "I exist," and "I do not exist," at the same instant.

In using the formula of Descartes, we note that it may be reduced to three equivalent predications:—

1. I exist (or am).
2. I think.
3. I am conscious, or am possessed of consciousness.

And thus the foundation of all knowledge in every individual human being may be conveniently characterized by the corresponding equivalent, but impersonal, terms—existence, thought, and consciousness.

Before we pass from this proposition, simple though it may seem, it is to be noted in so passing that we are already deviating, as it seems to me, from the views of some metaphysicians. The fundamental position is with some, as I read it, that in every cognition or act of knowledge there is an inseparable dualism, that of the self and the not-self, and that we can know nothing of either separately. To this I demur entirely, asserting as I venture to do, that each of us does know the self apart from all surroundings, the pure consciousness of existence with its implications constituting such knowledge. During most periods of existence it is no doubt true that the not-

self is present to our minds in most acts of cognition, but it is possible in contemplation or self study, as every one can verify for himself or herself, entirely to eliminate all of the not-self. We can abstract our thinking self from all external impressions under cover of conditions under which our senses are passive and bring no record, thus live in our inner existence only, and still be conscious of that existence. All functions and forms of cognitions may be eliminated and caused to vanish except the simple fact of that mind existence which lies at and is the citadel of being.

SECOND PROPOSITION.

Personal existence is then to each of us human beings a matter of absolute certainty at any given moment. But we are now able to take a further step; as "I exist" is our first proposition, so is "I am existing" our second.

It may appear upon the surface that this is an identical proposition with the last, but this is not really so. "I am existing," evolves a fresh idea; that of a lapse of something which is called time. The lapse may be infinitely small, but it is continuous. Its elements may each be regarded as of the nature of a differential co-efficient which is always integrating itself, and its continuous lapse for any measurable interval is as demonstrable as anything can be by experimental tests with regard to thought. Every thought takes up a portion of time. There is an interval between the beginning of a thought and its ending, very small no doubt, but still an interval. A theory of time is not necessary to our second proposition, but the idea of time does necessarily come to view as inevitably arising out of it, and constitutes itself as a fundamental concomitant of all subsequent knowledge. Not only is this the case, but it is evident that the con-

ception of continuous and unbroken effluxion, which is of the essence of time, imbues our minds with a general sentiment or feeling of continuity, primarily, of continuity and succession in our personal existence, and secondarily, of a probable continuity and unbroken succession in general as applied to other objects of knowledge.

It may be objected here that so far as our personal existence is concerned, consciousness also certifies us of breaches of continuity in existence, as for example, during sleep; but on examination it will be found that this cannot be proved. In fact it may be safely asserted that discontinuity in any full philosophical sense of the term, as the contradictory of philosophical continuity, is not a known element in the nature of existence so far as we can certify. That which looks like discontinuity in the operation and development of any formula shows the inadequacy of the formula. By limiting our view to considerations based, say, upon a theory of points, or of numbers, we may arrive at apparent discontinuities; but if any apparent discontinuity is thus disclosed, it is the point of view itself which is inadequate, and not sufficiently comprehensive.

THIRD PROPOSITION.

The next proposition we are able to lay down flows from the last. From "I am existing," we proceed to say "I have existed."

We have seen in our second proposition that to every act of thought there is a beginning and an ending. At the end of the thought we therefore predicate in that completed thought that we have existed prior to that moment of ending the thought; and thus, this our third proposition may perhaps be taken as a corollary to our second; but it is sufficiently important in its special

implications to take a position of its own. "I have existed," carries us back to the utmost limits of recollection which that wonderful phenomenon we call memory provides us, but no further. If memory were perfect and infallible, this third proposition with which we are dealing would provide for us an immense number of certain facts. But it cannot be either proved or assumed that memory is infallible, and outside of pure mental philosophy there is much evidence to the contrary. So that the formula "I have existed" as a matter of rigid reasoning might perhaps be taken as no more than a probability of the highest possible order. But it is a necessary postulate of all further knowledge; and in view of one of its connotations rises to so high a level in the implications of consciousness that, to my mind, at least, it becomes absolutely certain. That connotated corollary or implication is the fact inherent in consciousness which is called personal identity. That I is "I" is the primary dictum of consciousness; but consciousness goes further, and asserts that not only is this so, but that the "I" has existed in the past, and that, so far as recollection extends, "I" am and have been the same identical person. Consciousness, in that mode of itself which we call memory, tells us that the "I" which exists now has previously existed as a young child, as a youth, as an adult, as a grey-haired man or woman, and that through the whole history of apparent material change in and around us, our individual identity is actually, and has always continued to be the same. If we travel out of the purely mental field, and admit for a moment the world of outer observations, we recognise that the difference in the bodily appearance of the individual is one of a growing character, and, after a lengthy period, very great: physicists would, and do tell us, that every particle in our material frames is always changing, and

has changed entirely several times between youth and old age; but in spite of all this apparent evidence to the contrary, consciousness unhesitatingly avers that we, that is to say the "I" is the same identical being throughout. This is not a matter of education or environment. It is not a matter which admits of doubt. The dictum of consciousness is absolute, and must, I think, be regarded as being as certain as our present existence itself, and as giving our third proposition the value of certainty. Our own personal identity is, indeed, the only identity actually known to us as absolutely certain.

We must not leave this proposition without observing that here also comes into play the idea or conception of personal responsibility. Not only does consciousness aver that we have existed in continuous personal identity, but also that we are in some measure responsible for the past as well as for the present. Herein is to be found the genesis of *conscience*, and this *conscience*, as an element of consciousness, becomes the germ of many potent ideas with which mental philosophy in its expansion will always have to reckon. One of these is the idea of sin, or wrong doing, in the past. How the conception of incidents in our past lives having been in some particulars wrongful, and in others rightful, arises, so far as criterion is concerned, is a question of ethics; so far as we are concerned in our present proposition, we have simply to recognise the fact that this mode of consciousness arises out of the certainty which inheres in the dictum "I have existed."

It might clearly for some reasons be convenient to abjure the continuance of personal identity which we have just been considering, and to regard the mental being of each of us as a succession of identities closely related, and standing item by item in a mimetic relation of develop-

ment, but never at two intervals of time the same: this would facilitate the solution of some problems. But consciousness revolts against regarding itself as a series of terms, and insists upon its underlying and fundamental identity; so that if we are to admit the dicta of consciousness as supreme and final, this one of our continuous identity individually appears to be established as part of the bed-rock certainty of our being.

FOURTH PROPOSITION.

Our next proposition is, "I shall exist," and here many would assert that we cast loose from absolute certainty altogether. But, nevertheless, this is, at any rate for short periods, an invariable assumption of our fundamental consciousness. At any given moment of time we unhesitatingly take for granted that we shall continue to exist during the next moment, for a moment after that, and so on for an undefined period. It is here that the idea of continuity, which first arose under our second proposition, comes again into play, and upon which the assurance of consciousness with regard to the future is based. Nor within the operation of pure consciousness is there any ground for setting up the contrary (but not contradictory) proposition, that a time will come when we shall cease to exist. Excluding, as we have done up to now, physical considerations from our synthesis of thought, the prescription is entirely in favour of continued existence for an indefinite period, and there is no presumption of a purely mental kind to the contrary. I have no quarrel with those thinkers who, upon other grounds quite external to my argument, would say that there are physical reasons for believing mental existence to be evanescent and terminable; but all I lay down is, that consciousness gives us no such deliverance. It, indeed, rather recoils from it.

This continuity of existence, it is here proper to remark, is an idea which, both in looking backwards and in looking forward, confronts us with some exceedingly suggestive considerations. Consciousness assures us of our past existence, but tells us nothing of any beginning of it. Of a certain early portion of our individual physical life, of which we have other evidence, it gives us no record whatever. Our existence in the cradle is in after years a complete blank, and hence it is clear that there is no presumption whatever, from our not possessing any consciousness of a still *more previous* existence, that we may not have pre-existed. Our consciousness, being as we have seen independent of our varying physical constitution, may be a survival of other physical structure, or even, perhaps, of non-structural condition. The old faith of metempsychosis and transmigration is, therefore, one which, although there is no positive corroboration of it, possibly accords with the facts. There is no fundamental impossibility about it. So also with regard to the future. If the idea of persistent and continuous existence independent of structure is possible in the past, so also must it be in regard to the future, and thus consciousness in its deliverances sets no bound or limitation to its own permanence.

FIFTH PROPOSITION.

We have seen that in our preceding propositions we have already reached or, as some thinkers might say, overpassed the limits of absolute certainty. All other knowledge must then be a matter of probability only. But I am not concerned to define the boundary between certainty and high probability too closely, as different minds will take different views upon the position of the frontier line. Hitherto, we have had regard to existence,

consciousness, time, continuity, memory, identity, and responsibility. Whether it would be correct to describe some or other of these mental phases as innate ideas does not concern us, but that they are forms of thought always attendant upon, and incidental to, personal existence, is sufficient for us to assert. But our present proposition carries us on a step further. It is the predication by consciousness of the existence of a world outside of ourselves, whether physical, or intelligent only, or both, it is too early to say. Perhaps the simplest form of this proposition is to say that the "Ego" implies the non-Ego; that in the simple thought, "I exist," there is always coming in close succession to it the idea that the "Ego" is limited, and that it has a periphery, outside of which it does not exist, but outside of which periphery there is other existence. I concede at once that this is not admitted by philosophers of the purely idealist school. They contend that all that we can know at any time is simply a state of our own minds, and that it cannot be logically assumed as a matter of right reason that there is an external world at all. This proposition may be true in the most absolute sense of the term certainty, but it is here that probability comes to our aid. All the frequent and continuous impressions which appear to come to us from without, are explicable upon the theory of a world of objects outside of ourselves, and none of these impressions suggests the theory that there is no such existence outside of our thinking consciousness, so that the probability of this externality being actual and existent is in the proportion of a very great and always increasing number of mental observations and impressions compared to something near zero, a proportion which falls short of certainty by the small fraction which is nearly represented by one, or unity divided by the number of observations. The

human mind is a scale in which probabilities are weighed, and the probability of external existence is the one probability which most strongly asserts itself in the balance of this estimation.*

To this existence of the non-Ego, there come two probable implications. The first is the existence of intelligence or intelligences which are outside of us. The second is the existence of space, which the predication of an outside to ourselves leads us to as an apparently necessary condition. So far as we are conscious of possessing intelligence ourselves, so do we realize that there is a vast intelligence to which we are correlative; so far as we are conscious that we occupy a limited area, we import the idea of a necessary condition of area, that is to say, of the space which it occupies, and also of that body of space which is outside of it.

If I were asked which of these sequences of thought, both high probabilities only, commands the higher place, I should personally give it to the former, the assertion of intelligence outside of ourselves. The conception has a deeply seated sanction in consciousness, the idea of responsibility and of *conscience*, to which we have already referred in our third proposition, obviously corroborating it. If there were no intelligence outside of ourselves, whence the feeling of responsibility? I am, of course, carefully avoiding theological ground, but it appears to me that from the earliest years of their lives, and continuously during their lives, the idea always is existent in

* If a simple event has happened, say, one thousand times in one way, and never in another way, then the chances of its happening again in the same way is $\frac{1000 + 1}{1002}$, and the contrary chance is $\frac{1}{1002}$. The mind, by a natural failure of effort, looks upon high degrees of probabilities as certainties, but this is not a correct view; the greatest of improbabilities *may* happen. Great systems of thought have indeed been built upon this circumstance. We have only to consider in this regard the religions of the world.

human beings, that there is a vast intelligence with which they can be, if they desire it, in contact, and that the mental appeal to that intelligence, either in the form which is called prayer, or in any other way, is one which finds an immediate access to a Something around us which is not of ourselves, and which at the same time knows and understands.

The idea of space comes next as a predication which is a starting point of all physical cognition. And there is comprehended within this idea all objects, whether intelligent or otherwise, which come before us as subjects of observation. It still remains true that some philosophers tell us that all we really can and do know in this regard are modifications of our own minds only, and that any knowledge in the ontological sense of other existences is impossible. But I demur to the word impossible. I lay it down that there is a vast probability that our conceived knowledge is in accordance with the actual facts of the things as continuously apparent to us. Take for example the existence of our fellow human beings, as beings possessed of similar attributes, mental and physical, to our own. Either by means of that co-ordination of thoughts which we call language, or in many other different ways, we have appealing to our consciousness endless observations and impressions which are fully explained by the existence of beings like ourselves in all essential respects, and though there perhaps may be some impressions based upon details of a fewer and minor kind to the contrary, these are of so little weight that the scale of probability stoops towards its utmost limit as to the general facts of resemblance. Exactly in the same way, proceeding further, though with still overwhelming probability, we come at the qualities of the animal and vegetable, and even mineral kingdom, with so much assurance and confidence, that by the great mass

of mankind it would seem absurd even to retain the smallest element of doubt as to the accurate correspondence of these things around us with the ideas which in our minds represent them.

I need hardly say, however, that the common judgment of mankind in such matters is not to be accepted as strict proof, except in a probable sense of varying weight, and it is necessary now to revert briefly to a more analytical method of pursuing our subject by way of corroborating our argument.

All of our cognitions, apart from these matters with which I have already dealt in our four primary propositions, will be found on reflection to reach us either through the operation of our senses, our imagination, or our reasoning power. There is no other avenue known to us by which a knowledge, or supposed knowledge of things outside of ourselves can come. This being so, if we can show that all these three processes are liable to error; that our senses may deceive us; that our imagination may run riot; and that the reasoning process itself is sometimes at fault; we shall clearly have proved in detail the general terms of our proposition, already asserted synthetically, that all our knowledge, saving that arising directly out of consciousness, is of a probable character and status only. For with the admixture of a possibility of error, even if that possibility be represented by some such small fraction as that which we have already referred to, certainty, in full and absolute sense of the term, clearly vanishes. What then are we able to say upon these matters?

The reply is simple and obvious. It is a matter within the knowledge of every one that his or her senses are sometimes at fault. Sight, hearing, feeling, tasting, and smelling, are all processes liable to occasional error in

ordinary life with the most normal of human beings, whilst the recorded history of hallucinations furnishes very many confirmatory instances. Our powers of imagination, though casting often a bright halo over prosaic conditions, notoriously often mislead humanity as to bare and literal facts: our memory, wonderful as it is in its scope, is well-known to be liable to error: our reasoning process, whether it is employed in the framing of deductions or otherwise, carries with it a want of absolute and conclusive certainty, unless, indeed, we assume universal propositions which we cannot verify: thus, without going further into details, we can see clearly that the added knowledge which comes to us from outside of ourselves is always questionable, always carries with it an increment of possible inaccuracy, and thus avoids certainty in its completest sense. Bishop Butler in his admirable *Analogy of Religion—Natural and Revealed*, tells us that, “probability is the very guide of life”; he applies it as a criterion upon the subjects which were of all others most sacred to himself, and I hope to most of us; and we are, in my opinion, justified on the philosophical grounds now put forward, in taking a further step still than Bishop Butler has taken, by rejecting altogether that possibility of demonstrative evidence which he has reserved, in so far at least as demonstration implies certainty: and we are justified in laying down the more general proposition, that *all* and everything we know, or can know, outside of our own inner consciousness, is known to us in the probable sense only, but without absolute certitude.

Do these considerations lead us on then into a Serbonian bog of scepticism? By no means. We recognize rather all observed facts, and weigh the probabilities relating to them. Knowing that absolute and final truth is inaccessible in the beyond which lies about us to beings

of our finite capacity, we deal with probabilities only, always admit the possibilities of error which beset us, take account of and act upon probabilities, and constitute out of them our reasoned systems of provisional knowledge, and in this we conform to the limited capacity and requirements of our intellectual being. This is, indeed, the very principle and method upon which all modern investigation in physical science is actually based. I was much interested, for example, so lately as in the *Proceedings* of this Society during that excellent lecture we had from our Vice-President, Mr. R. C. Johnson, to hear him state a particular view with regard to the lines of the solar spectrum, not as certain, but as being probable, approximately in the proportion of three trillions to one. The scientific investigator thus frames his provisional hypotheses, binding together past and present observations with sufficient detachment as to be able to cast loose so soon as and if subsequent observations set in any respect against them. He continues to multiply what metaphysicians term cognitions as the material of his temporary assumptions, knowing that it is always within the bounds of possibility that some fresh series of facts may largely discredit previous conclusions.* The front door of his intellectual edifice is always kept open.

In regard to more abstract and more purely intellectual forms of thought, we see that by means of a probable philosophy the reasoning process itself, instead of being tied to the dictum *de omni et nullo*, after the manner of the formal logicians from Aristotle to Whately, is emancipated from such technicalities into a wider field of estimation. We no longer employ universal proportions by way of

*Take for example the present electrical theory of matter as contrasted with previous theories; or, again, the new view of the properties of matter derived from the discovery and behaviour of *radium*.

major premises: we realize that the "all" and the "none" which lie at the basis of the orthodox syllogism are never, and can never, be really known to us, and that such knowledge is quite inconsistent with the restricted and limited kingdom of humanity. All we have to work upon is really such number of anterior cognitions as we ourselves, or mankind in general, have actually been able to make, so that our provisional and provisionally accepted inferences follow with a sanction or degree of assurance in *ratio* to the number of such accredited observations or cognitions, but in no case attain to the level of absolute truth. To those who would wish to impart to these considerations something of the nature of numerical value, I may say in passing that the most convenient popular treatise on the mathematical aspect of the subject is that of Professor de Morgan,* the great treatise of Laplace on Probability† being far too difficult for ordinary beings, though it is undoubtedly to that great mathematician that we are indebted for the supreme method which has lifted the science of probabilities to the position which it now occupies.‡ I will not trouble you with any details myself upon any technicalities of this sort, but simply point out that the method of the probable is evidently applicable to all spheres of knowledge and thought. It enables us to traverse every field unencumbered by technical limitations, tolerant, receptive of all new impressions, and knowing that it is by the accumulation of impressions that our intellectual constitution is built up. It would of course be

* "Essay on Probabilities," *Cabinet Cyclopædia*.

† *Théorie Analytique des Probabilités*.

‡ As witness the application to it of his Theta function $\frac{2}{\sqrt{\pi}} \int_0^t e^{-x^2} dx$

I venture the opinion that the idea of this was derived in some measure from the Witch of Agnesi, otherwise known as the *versiera*.

idle for me to attempt to apply this general method now in any adequate number of illustrations, inasmuch as the possible compass of such illustrations and applications is practically unbounded. I will only select for the time at my disposal one illustration, and that partly because it enables me to bring before you again some reference to a subject with which I have dealt at more length before this Society, and into my views upon which I was led by considerations such as those I have placed before you to-night. The subject serves for that reason as a natural and legitimate method of showing the connection which exists between those views and the philosophic basis just expressed, with which they are, to my mind, in harmony.

We have seen that, as regards external facts, our knowledge on any subject outside of ourselves must only be accepted as provisional, and that a perfectly open mind should be kept, having regard to the possibility, however small, of some contradictory cognition or cognitions. It is therefore no adequate argument against that degree of certitude which is the quality of our knowledge to say that the proofs or arguments which we employ upon any matter fall short of absolute demonstration. It is sufficient to show that a great number of cognitions agree in corroborating a certain proposition, and that none has been alleged or discovered at variance with it. These circumstances existing, the proposition is entitled to be accepted as provisionally true, admitting always that possibility of error which we have found invariably to exist in regard to all cognitions outside of ourselves.

This is exactly the position in which the theory I have propounded of a general imitative or mimetic function in human nature, and in the natural world generally, will be

found to stand. Some of you may perhaps remember that we have traced together to this function a very great number of the phenomena of human life and conduct, and seen that in its different phases, conscious, semi-conscious, and unconscious, it is a constant factor in human life and its developments.* In pursuing the same line of cognitions we have found that so many of the other units of the animal world showed similar phenomena, that this mimetic function was probably true of the whole animal world. We have found reason for assigning to the operation of the same function the otherwise most difficult to explain of the phenomena of heredity. Reaching still further, and with what is no doubt a lessened though still potent degree of probability, we have found phenomena of a similar mimetic character in the inorganic world, raising, indeed, the doubt whether in speaking of different natural units being *the same*, as, for example, we do of two volumes of a gas, or a metal, in spite of the obvious fact that no two things can possibly be one and the same in strictness,—whether we are not in so doing really admitting in regard to these so-called substances only the generality of the mimetic function itself. And we arrive at the conclusion vastly probable, because there is nothing of weight to contravene it, that this active function, or principle of imitation, or *mimesis*, is one which exists and asserts itself through the whole range of so much of the natural world as is in the philosophic sense known to us. This is indeed exactly the line of reasoning on which alone it is possible to establish provisionally other accepted theories, as, for example, that of organic evolution, and it is of some interest to note that, if the mimetic factor be admitted, it supplies a directive influence which is evi-

* See also *Imitation, or the Mimetic Force*, Simpkin, 1900: by the Author.

dently missing, or, as a Scottish lawyer would say, *a-wanting*, in that great theory itself.

That some such directive influence is *a-wanting* is generally admitted, and has been sought after by the human mind for centuries before the theory of evolution was formulated. It was this felt requirement that brought into being, for example, the theory of the *Spiritus Mundi* and soul of the world, which originated probably long prior to, but was indicated by Plato, and continued to permeate the ideas of Platonists, of the illuminati of occult science, of the Rosicrucians, and other adepts, generation after generation, down, at any rate, to the time of Cornelius Agrippa. It appeared to these thinkers that some secret principle was required to account for the inter-connected phenomena of the universe; the human mind then, as now, sought for generalization, and this was with them the outcome: that all that exists on earth has its spiritual counterpart; that all things thence derive their "secret virtue which becomes operative by means of the soul of the world. As the soul acts upon the human body, or as the soul of the universe produces all its varied movements and phenomena, so in every single object the concealed virtue or spirit makes it to be what it is, and gives it form and quality."* As the poet Spenser puts it with regard to human beings—

For from the soule the bodie forme doth take,
For soule is forme and doth the bodie make.

All this, however, is of the past. But we should think with respect of these speculations which evidence the requirement already referred to of the human mind, though in view of modern science they look extravagant to us.†

* *Evenings with the Skeptics*, Longmans, 1881.

† A survival of these ideas is perhaps to be found in the current metaphorical phrase "the spirit of the age."

Let me, however, not fail to draw your attention to the fact that these views have passed away because there was no element of probability founded upon observation directly in their favour, so that this obsolete theory illustrates, in a negative sense, by its own failure, the actual and positive value of a theory such as we have brought forward, which *does* rely upon those very elements of observation and probability, and at the same time accounts for the phenomena which these thinkers of the past sought empirically to explain.

And now I draw this dissertation to an end. My excuse for its length must be that for over a quarter of a century I have been bringing occasionally before this Society sundry papers, all of which, with one exception, have been based upon, and have flowed from the view of things which has been put before you to-night. It may seem to those who differ from me, metaphysically and otherwise, to be illogical to justify present conduct by admitting past action of a similar kind. But some, perhaps, will agree with me in whole or in part. If my views are wrong it is a matter of old standing and will soon be forgotten. If there is truth in them, I have confidence in believing that some abler thinker will take up the line as it falls from my feebler hands, and carry it on and through the various circles and spheres of humanity until it acquires so much of recognition and position as is its due.

FURTHER RESEARCHES AMONG THE VECTIGALIA TEMPLORUM.

By J. HAMPDEN JACKSON, F.R.G.S., F.C.I.S.

PRESIDENT.

[In a lecture delivered to this Society on 18th February, 1901, I described the emergence among the primitive communities of mankind of the first crude elements of Religious Revenue, and showed what additions accreted to the list in Nomad times, and in the after-period of Agricultural settlement. In a second lecture (13th November, 1905), I described the evolution under the Religious authority of certain further revenues, and began an analysis of the Temple Vectigalia of Chaldæa, Assyria, Egypt, Phœnicia, Palestine, Greece and Rome. In my Presidential Address of 4th October, 1907, the Public Festivals of the ancient Temples were described, their importance as the main engine of sacred finance was demonstrated, and the festival revenues were dealt-with in detail. In concluding to-night my analysis of the Temple Vectigalia of the countries named, I reserve for possible future treatment the sacred revenues of Farther Asia, of Gaul, Scandinavia, etc., and of Mexico and Peru.]

I.

We may class the Vectigalia Templorum into three broad leading categories:—

- (A.) Revenues applicable to the building and endowment of temples.
- (B.) Those applicable to furnishing, repairs, and maintenance of the services.
- (C.) Those remaining for staff expenses, and general and special outlays.

In previous lectures, Class A has been shown to contain the following items, all of which have been already dealt-with in detail :—

(A.) FUNDS FOR THE BUILDING AND ENDOWMENT OF TEMPLES.

(I.) Hoards from pre-existing shrines, consisting of:—

- (a) Accumulated offerings.
- (b) Deposited wealth and treasure.
- (c) Reserves of State and public bodies.

(II.) Offerings and payments from Sovereigns, consisting of:—

- (a) Votive temples
- (b) Land grants.
- (c) Gifts from hoarded war-spoils.
- (d) Grants from the royal treasury.
- (e) Tenths of crown booty.
- (f) Forced labour of prisoners of war.

(III.) Payments by the subjects, consisting of:—

- (a) Votive temples.
- (b) Vow-gifts of land and treasure.
- (c) Soldiers' tenths of booty.
- (d) Poll tax during temple building operations.
- (e) Assessments on cities.
- (f) Tallage on the richer men.
- (g) Free service of artificers.
- (h) Public subscriptions.

It has also been shown that Class B included the following revenues, all which I have previously described:

(B.) FUNDS FOR FURNISHING, REPAIRS, AND MAINTENANCE OF THE SERVICES.

(I.) Income from the sacred domain, consisting of:—

- (a) Produce of the soil (tilled by the temple serfs and Hieroduli).
- (b) Domain rents and profits.
- (c) Receipts from farmed-out lands and serfs.
- (d) Profits of sacred mines and fisheries.
- (e) Income from sacred flocks and herds.

(II.) The sacred Quota: on crops and products of the national territories.

(III.) Compulsory imposts on towns and districts.

- (IV.) Temple tribute (to Panegyric centre).
 (V.) Sanctuary dues (to Amphictyonic shrine).

Class *C* being of such length as to necessitate division into three series, I dealt in November, 1905, with nine of its items; in October, 1907, with nine more; and to-night propose to deal with thirteen that still await examination: after which the following list will show the completed table for this class:—

(C.) FUNDS FOR STAFF EXPENSES AND GENERAL AND SPECIAL
 OUTLAYS.

SERIES I.

- (a) The sacrificial tariff.
 (b) The hide-money.
 (c) Profit from temple sales of victims, fuel, frankincense, libations, etc.
 (d) Firstfruits and firstlings.
 (e) The sacred tithes.
 (f) Statutory offerings.
 (g) Sorcery and divination fees.
 (h) Healing and treatment fees, and use of sacred waters.
 (i) Frontier tolls at border shrines.

SERIES II.

- (a) Oracle fees.
 (b) Mystery initiations and degree fees.
 (c) Trespass money and purification fees.
 (d) Compulsory alms.
 (e) Vow redemptions and commutations.
 (f) Profit of sacred fairs and markets.
 (g) Sale of pardons.
 (h) Temple offertory boxes.
 (i) Gate-money and entrance dues.

SERIES III.

- (a) Banking and deposit profits.
 (b) The sacred monopolies.
 (c) Profits of the sacred Mark.
 (d) Oaths, ordeals and fines.
 (e) Burials revenue.
 (f) Earnings of the female Hieroduli.
 (g) Charges at sacred groves.
 (h) Profits of commercial ventures.
 (i) Revenue from guardianships, escheats, etc.
 (j) Sales of priestly rank.
 (k) Collections and mendicancy.
 (l) State payments.
 (m) Sundry other revenue.

II.

CLASS C: SERIES III.

Having completed our classification of the Vectigalia, we will now examine in detail the first series of items under Class C, arranged (as we have just seen) under thirteen heads.

(a) BANKING AND DEPOSIT PROFITS.

Even the earliest temples had hoards of offerings and deposits. "The temples of that remote period," says Robertson-Smith, "were not so much even houses for the Gods as store-houses for the vessels and treasures of the shrines." There were embodied in these shrine-hoards several different categories of treasure, for, in addition to the accumulated offerings of worshippers, and the deposits heaped up through the centuries, there were in the more powerful sanctuaries the reserve treasures of city authorities, of State exchequers, and often the funds of minor temples, lodged there for safer keeping. In the central sanctuaries at the capitals, moreover, there were portions, if not the whole, of the palace funds and balances, and the valuables deposited by successive monarchs and their families as collateral security against loans.

The account given us in II Maccabees, third chapter, distinguishes between some of these classes of temple treasures, and instances the cupidity such hoards excited in the breasts of civil rulers. Onias, the high priest at Jerusalem (312 B.C.), tells Heliodorus (the treasurer of King Seleucus) that "there was much money laid up for the relief of widows and fatherless children" (*i.e.*, trust money of temple guardianship), "and that 400 talents of silver, and 200 of gold (£900,000 in all) belonged to Hyrcanus, a man of great dignity" (*i.e.*, a private deposit account). Then he further mentions a fund "to which

none of these things pertained," namely: "money for the account of the sacrifices."

But coin and bullion were after all only a small part of the hoards under priestly charge at the temples. There are abundant particulars at command, and the following list embodies these fairly for all kinds of temples, of all sorts of deities, except that graven images and paintings were excluded at Jerusalem.

ANALYSIS OF THE SHRINE HOARDS.

- (a) Ingots and bars of gold, silver, and bronze.
- (b) Accumulations of coin.
- (c) Large bowls of solid gold, silver, and brass.
- (d) Other vessels of gold and silver.
- (e) Shields and plaques of beaten gold and brass.
- (f) Statues of solid gold, silver, and ivory.
- (g) Gems, jewellery, and gold and silver chains and bracelets.
- (h) Costly apparel—embroidered and jewelled vestments.
- (i) Furniture of gold, silver, ivory, and precious woods.
- (j) Sculpture, paintings, and other works of art.
- (k) Many other precious things.

Deposited valuables were carefully separated from those actually pertaining to the temples, but after a certain period were added to the general fund, three such categories frequently merging with the property of the gods, viz.: (i), unclaimed; (ii), forfeited; and (iii), confiscated deposits.

The storage of the treasure-hoards was in this wise: (a) The richest gold and silver articles were in cupboards and shelves in the Opisthodomos, and careful inventories, cut in marble, still show (as at the Parthenon) how such and such objects, received on such and such dates, are on the first, second, or third shelves; (b) Other portions of the treasures were (as at Ephesus) in a room on one side of the Pronaos; (c) Others, again (specially large and valuable), were in the Cella; (d) In Rome, the temples of

Castor, Saturn, Concordia, and others, had treasuries sunk into the floors under the Podium; (*e*) At Olympia, Delphi, and other great sanctuaries, elegant votive buildings were erected as overflow treasuries within the sacred precinct, and filled with gifts from special cities or peoples; (*f*) At all temples, the smaller articles of gold and silver were, at stated intervals, melted down, and bowls of large size made out of them for convenient storage, bowls within bowls being piled up to considerable heights; (*g*) As coin accumulated it was used to purchase more bowls, or gems; and (*h*) when no space was again available for the heaps, all the bowls were afresh melted down, and ingots and bars of solid gold or silver made from them, which were stored in the inner treasury, or buried beneath the temple floor near the statue; (*i*) Such offerings and votive gifts as became worthless or inconvenient were from time to time buried in long trenches within the temple precinct, and covered over.

Throughout the Greek world, and in the later temple periods in Rome, sculpture, painting, and art treasures of every kind accumulated at the shrines. (i) Egypt and Asia had already brought to perfection their wood and ivory carvings, and filagree work in gold and silver—the masterpieces of their craftsmen being lodged in their temples—and similar votive gifts adorned the sanctuaries of all the Mediterranean countries. (ii) But Greece brought statuary and wall-painting to a perfection never since attained, and all her temples and precincts were exquisitely adorned with these arts. So late as Pliny's time, and after Nero had already taken away 400 bronze statues from Delphi, the sacred peribolus there still contained 3,000 statues, as also did that of Olympia. And these cases are but typical. (iii) In Rome, in the sumptuous sanctuaries of Capitoline Jupiter

and Apollo Palatinus, within both of which hundreds of stolen statues and paintings from Greece encumbered the footway and blocked up the light, the censors effected a forcible clearance. (iv) Ephesus, too, was a rich museum of art treasures; its noble amazons by Phidias, Polyclitus, Cresilas, and Phradmon; its great paintings (one by Apelles, of Alexander holding a thunderbolt) are recorded in history, and there were a hundred other repositories of art such as (v) Cnidos, with its priceless Aphrodite by Praxiteles; and (vi) Cos with its veiled one by the same sculptor, etc., etc.

Among other precious things of the ancient sanctuaries were (a) the great Zodiacal circle of gold surrounding a tomb in Amen's Theban temple; (b) the vine of solid gold at Jerusalem (each cluster the size of a man) which covered the holy place, and added yearly to its golden fruit and shoots by continuous meltings-down of small gold offerings; (c) then there was the pillar of pure gold in Melkarth's temple at Tyre; and (d) the thousand talents of gold (£1,400,000) plated on Apollo's shrine at Carthage. These are but the beginnings, and not even the richest of such possessions at temples; think, for instance, of (e) Domitian's sixteen million pounds sterling of plated gold on the walls and roofs of Jupiter Capitolinus!

The accumulations of wealth at some of the shrines appear incredible, but similar accumulations are found all over the world. In every ancient land, all that it contains of precious metal is speedily absorbed by the temple system, and the whole of Egypt and the Asian states would have fallen into exhaustion and decay but for the periodical plunder and dispersion of their locked-up hoards. (a) We read particulars in I Esdras ii, 13-14, of no less than 5,469 vessels of gold and silver given back to Jerusalem from Babylon long after the sack of the

temple by Nebuchadnezzar in 587 B.C. What the plunder of bullion and treasure must have been, of which these were a mere residue, we cannot even surmise. Josephus tells us of the later temple with its great vine, and its massive gold crowns presented by the Maccabees, and gigantic gold candelabra from the proselyte Queen of Adiabene. Before Titus, in A.D. 70, broke into the city, the Roman and Syrian armies had successively sacked the temple, and after Titus made the breach flames were put to the shrine, robbing him of much that was costly and destructible. Yet so vast were the hoards he carried away that the value of gold fell 50 % throughout Syria and the East. (b) When Xerxes, in 475 B.C., plundered the temple of Belus in Nineveh, Diodorus records that he took away 7,350 talents of treasure (£21,000,000). (c) After the burning by Cambyses of Amen's temple at Thebes, in 524 B.C., £3,640,000 were found in the ruins, and so late as Cleopatra's time, when Antony (*circa* 40 B.C.), plundered all the Egyptian temples, the interest of money, on his return to Italy, fell from 12 % to 4 % throughout Italy and the neighbouring states. (d) At Delphi, in 357 B.C., the Phocians came in after two other great plunderings of the temple of Apollo and a devastating fire, but were able to find and carry off £2,500,000. (e) At Hierapolis, Crassus (*circa* 53 B.C.) took many days simply in weighing the plundered gold of Astarte, and a like time at Apheka in weighing the gold of Baal. (f) At Argyllea, in 384 B.C., Dionysius of Syracuse took 1,000 talents each from the temples of Leukothea and Eilithyia (£2,900,000 in all). (g) At mount Eryx, Licinius plundered 40 million sesterces (£354,000) from the shrine of Venus; and (h) even the island temples of little Samothrace and Samos yielded £244,000 and £1,500,000 to the pirates of the Golden Gulf.

Such facts and figures help us to readily understand the wars of plunder waged by Assyria, Egypt, and other ancient states, and they equally demonstrate what facilities lay in temple hoards for extended and profitable banking operations. (a) In Chaldea, says Maspero, the temples (4,000–2,300 B.C.) lent out the greater part of their money revenues, and the majority of the priests kept actual banking houses. (b) Mr. C. H. W. Johns, whose invaluable work on Babylonian and Assyrian Laws and Contracts is of such interest to the student, says of the tablets from Babylon and Nineveh that:—

From the earliest times down to the latest we have references to temple treasuries and storehouses. The temples were commercial institutions of high efficiency, their accumulations of all sorts of raw products being enormous. They let out on easy terms, usually, all kinds of raw material. To the poor, charitable advances were made; to the metayer tenants, advances requisite to that system of land tenure; to slaves living beyond the precinct; and to contractors, who took the materials on purely business terms. The return had to be in kind of the same amount, or with interest as stipulated. In some cases, the wool or other textile stuffs were to be repaid in made-up goods: definite fabrics, garments, rugs, or hangings. Some part of the stock went for garments and vestments for the temple staff; some for the images of the gods themselves; but the bulk was used for trade.

(c) Mr. St. Chad Boscawen says (of the same period and countries) that the temples—

Lent seed-corn to farmers, skins to leather-workers, and wool to weavers. All corn loans had to be repaid at harvest time. Many loans of money were made from the temple treasuries, and among the British museum tablets are several relating to the repayment of these loans of silver.

(d) An interesting loan from the temple of Belit of Akkad is that of a silver vessel, 15 minas weight, borrowed by Nikal-iddin at the time of the Elamite invasion.

The royal loans from the Chaldean temples, on occa-

sions of emergency, were, as in other countries and at other periods, bound to be repaid as soon as the enemy was got rid of, or the ally paid off. "The treasures hoarded in the sanctuaries of ancient nations" says Robertson Smith "were a kind of reserve fund, preserved by religious sanctions against speculation and individual encroachment, but available for public objects in time of need." (a) Thus, in 668 B.C., the Theban Amen loaned to the city authorities one half of his incredible hoards that these might bribe off the plundering armies of Assurbanipal of Assyria. (b) The temple of Jahveh had scarcely possessed itself of the treasure hoards bequeathed to it by David, before successive kings of Judah had thrice to borrow all to pay out invaders or buy help from allies. Rehoboam in 928 B.C. paid the whole to Shoshenk I of Egypt. Asa, 20 years later, borrowed all again to secure Syria's help against Israel; and a century later Joash borrowed the entire contents of the temple treasury to avert Hazael's invasion. (c) There are seven or eight more such cases at Jerusalem alone, and Professor G. A. Smith remarks in his new and able work on that city:—"That the kings repaid their forced loans by gifts of land or new treasure, appears from the fact that there were always funds in the Judæan temple when required." (a) A quaint passage in Judges ix, 4, tells us how Abimelech hired a number of "vain and light persons" at Shechem to murder his brothers that he might be crowned King of Israel. In the beginning of the verse it is written: "And the men of Shechem gave Abimelech seventy pieces of silver *out of the house of Baal-berith*" (wherewith he hired these persons). We have there an instance of the loaning-out of temple treasure by a Canaanite shrine of Baal, about 1250 B.C. (b) Among the earliest, as well as among the very latest temple-loans were those made

on interest to merchant buyers at the sacred fairs of Mesopotamia, Syria, and Greece. and the presumption is strong that in the great fairs of Egypt and Palestine, similar banking facilities would be offered by the temples of those countries. (c) Demosthenes speaks of the moneys lent out by Apollo of Delphi; and (d) inscriptions show that large numbers of private individuals, as well as bankers and public bodies, enjoyed loan accommodation from the temple of Apollo at Delos. (e) The gods of Olympia were also active bankers, lending out their funds even to foreign towns and states. In the Peloponnesian War Sparta and the allies obtained heavy loans from Zeus to build a navy and sustain the war against Athens. We are told also that the accounts of Zeus Olympios were kept with great exactitude, all loans having to be repaid with interest at the times fixed in the contracts. (f) The Zosterian Athena received interest—as an Attic inscription shews—upon some treasure pledged by the State with that goddess against some loan; and (g) one of the shrines in Corcyra lent out a large amount of money, devoting year by year its interest receipts to the festival games of Dionysos. (h) In Greece, loans without interest were unknown, and the common rates for temple money were 12 to 18 per cent., whilst those of private bankers (whose security would probably be second-rate) were usually 36 per cent. (i) No interest is known to have ever been given in any ancient country upon deposit-money or deposited treasure.

(b) THE SACRED MONOPOLIES.

There were probably in all countries a considerable number of profitable monopolies in temple keeping. (a) The fishing-rights enjoyed by the temples of Ephesus, Memphis, and Thebes are a case in point, and there were great numbers of sacred rivers and lakes under similar

reservations as to their fishing. This aspect of monopoly, and (b) the at least equally lucrative rights of exclusive sale of sacrificial fuel, victims, frankincense, libations, etc., etc., at the temples, have, however, been already treated upon in my previous papers. (c) Byssus cloth, the linen mummy-cloth used in Egypt, appears to have been a very ancient sacred monopoly in that country, and so profitable that, under the Ptolemies, a state tax was levied on it. Of the proceeds of this monopoly to the Egyptian temples we can judge by the estimate that, between 2,000 B.C. and 700 A.D. there were 420 million mummies made in Egypt, at a cost of three millions sterling per annum. The embalmers were in intimate association with the temples, and were themselves probably men of priestly family. It is not an unreasonable assumption therefore, that the temples and sacred orders may have netted at least a million a year from the item of Byssus cloth. (d) Another sacred monopoly in Egypt appears to have been papyrus, the cultivation of which reed was made an object of special care in the Sebennitic nome, under priestly direction. The papyrus antiquorum has now practically disappeared. It grew to the height of ten feet, its roots being in shallow water, and its uses in Egypt were manifold. The root for fuel, the stem for baskets and light boats, the lower part of the stem yielded also a popular food substance, sweet and aromatic. The bark was the general material for ropes and mats, and was also used for making sandals of, and forming wicks for candles. For writing material the stem was cut into thin strips, and a second layer of similar strips placed crosswise over them. The leaves thus formed were then pressed and beaten smooth together, dried, and pasted on to other similar leaves when a longer document was required. In Ptolemæan and Roman times papyrus for recording and

writing became a leading export of Egypt. It was always dear, as may be judged by the using of the same material over and over again for fresh records, the old ones being washed off.

(e) I think also we may assume that the far-famed Tyrian purple, the imperial dye reserved for so many centuries to the ruling and wealthy classes of the world, was a monopoly of Melkarth. Dr. Frazer, in his *Notes on Pausanias*, tells us that:—

The shellfish chiefly used by the Tyrians for this dye was the *Murex trunculus*, but sometimes the *Murex brandaris*. On the beach at Sidon, enormous masses of shells of the first of these may still be seen, a heap more than 100 yards long and 6 to 7 yards high, the head of each shell broken as by a hammer, to extract the mollusc. In Greece heaps of the *Murex brandaris* may be seen in various places near the sea. The Phœnicians set down the discovery of the dye to the dog of Melkarth, which happened to fasten its teeth in one of these shellfish, and its lips were seen to be stained purple.

Such was probably the fable fabricated by the priests of Melkarth to account-for and justify a sacred monopoly over this valuable product.

(c) PROFITS OF THE SACRED MARK.

This branch of the vectigalia is to some extent intertwined with the kindred one of revenues from various registrations in ancient countries. Of the latter there were so many that I shall to-night have to content myself with their bare enumeration. The following being only some of the incidents necessitating attendance with offerings at a temple, and a more or less formal enrolment ceremony:—

- | | |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| (a) Births. | (g) Deaths. |
| (b) Namings. | (h) Interments. |
| (c) Adolescence. | (i) Adult yearly survivals. |
| (d) Betrothals. | (j) Caste entries. |
| (e) Marriages. | (k) Vocation rank. |
| (f) Annulments of marriage. | |

(1) In Greece, babies were registered yearly at the APATURIA; (2) in Sparta, older boy babies at the TTTHENIDIA; (3) at Athens, adopted children at the THARGELIA; (4) little girls of five to ten at the BRAURONIA; (6) pubescent youths at the AGRAULIA; (7) nubile girls at the CARYA and ANTIESPHORIA; (8) both youths and maidens at the APATURIA. (9) In Rome, youths of fifteen were enrolled at the LIBERALIA; (10) matrons registered at the APOLLINARES LUDI, and so on. (11) There is plentiful evidence that in ancient Chaldea and Egypt, as all through the Eastern world, registrations of some or all the above kinds were compulsory, and brought abundant fees to the sacred treasuries. "The first act of a child at puberty," says one of the Egibi tablets of Babylon, "is to pay a double poll-tax at the temple." (12) And in Egypt we may see the sacred scribes recording the caste entries and the vocation ranks.

On whatever mission men, women, or children went to a temple in any country, none must go without an offering. No Jew, as we remember, must "appear before Jahveh empty." In most ancient lands you went for one kind of registry to one god or goddess, and for another to altogether another deity. The temple registrations appear to have been most systematic in Egypt and Chaldea, less frequent in Phœnicia and Judæa and Greece, and least frequent of all in Rome, the civil power, as it grew in efficiency, gradually assuming to itself this helpful and lucrative branch of administrative work.

In a previous lecture I shewed examples of Chaldean boundary stones bearing the sacred mark, and explained the essentiality of such marks to all boundaries diplomatic, provincial, and civic in the ancient East. (a) It is now further ascertained that the mark was equally essential for all delimitations of private land

boundaries. (b) Throughout the Mesopotamian empires, moreover, all mortgages and contracts, as well as deeds of sale, were executed under oath at the temples by the parties concerned, and the tablets containing such covenants all show the sacred mark (as in the case now on the screen, where the seals of the parties are followed by duplicate impressions of the mark, one for each of the parties, and placed there apparently at the time of each separate oath). After this completion, each party took his copy of the mortgage or deed, and a third copy was deposited in the temple archives. The same seal appears in Babylon to have been used for all classes of tablet documents.

(c) I do not find any sacred mark at Jerusalem, where it would probably be excluded as a "graven image," but it existed in Phœnicia, and (d) there are evidences of it in Greece at Olympia, where Zeus apparently authenticated land deeds on condition of the insertion of a clause providing some perpetual payment to himself, and put his imprimatur on bronze tablet contracts bearing similar conditions in his own favour.

(e) Fees for valuations under the sacred mark were an interesting branch of temple revenue in the Chaldean countries. In connection, probably, with the sacred fairs at first, then later with the extending requirements of trade and commerce, resort had to be made to some authoritative tribunal to fix values on merchantable goods and other property, and this extensive business came into the hands of the temples, sometimes in the capacity of arbitrators, but more frequently as actual fixers of market prices. The fee for such appraisements is frequently spoken of, not only in Chaldean documents, but those of later date relating to temples in Syria and Phœnicia. In Babylon it was the custom to make all valuations "before

God" (*i.e.*, in presence of the priests), and the *Encyclopædia Biblica* is doubtless right in assuming that the rise to power of great priestly dynasties in that country and in Egypt was facilitated by the wealth accruing to them through temple control of all commerce.

(*f*) Then we come to the sacred mark on manumitted slaves. A Greek or Roman master, wishing to give his slaves their freedom, presented them to the temple of the city deity in his city. The temple marked the slave, who thereby became free from human control, and—as the temples did not enforce the deities' claims to such slaves—the men became actually their own masters, making a fee payment to the temple at the time, and the mark settled all questions for any subsequent claimant of their bodies. At Delphi the fee for the mark was fifteen staters. In Italy, the temple of Feronia at Terracina was specially devoted to the manumission of slaves, and Professor J. G. Frazer has pointed out that at some temples the form of manumission practised was other than that above described. The frequent mention of the sale of slaves to a god or goddess draws attention to this ingenious form whereby a slave recovered his freedom. With no civil rights, he could not legally buy his own freedom, but by paying the sum to a temple, its deity became the nominal buyer, and the thing was done, some fee or consideration being first reserved to the god or goddess, no doubt.

(*g*) Then there was the sacred mark affixed on pilgrims visiting the great temple shrines, a practice common to this day all over India and the far East, and which obtained in ancient Egypt and Syria: probably also in Chaldea. I am not necessarily alluding to the mysteries-marks, but to a body-mark, or other visible imprint, affixed in testimony that a man or woman had visited certain

shrines of special sanctity, and there performed all the regulation devotions.

(h) Lastly, there was the sacred mark on refugees. It is interesting to find the evidence of this practice in one of the oldest stories in the Jewish scriptures. "I shall be a fugitive and a vagabond in the earth," says Cain (after his murder of Abel), "and it shall come to pass that everyone that findeth me shall slay me." So Jahveh set the sacred mark upon Cain, "lest any finding him should kill him." The ancient institution of cities of refuge was far older than the Old Testament; in fact, it is probably as old as the origin of temple sanctuaries, one of the central ideas of a sanctuary being that of an asylum for refugees. (1) In Egypt and Chaldea, however, no trace of refugee marks or asylum fees has so far come before me, though the Assyrians are believed to have had both. (2) In Syria and Phœnicia many sanctuaries had, from the earliest times, and down to the Roman occupation, an unlimited right of Asylum, and Tacitus describes the enquiry instituted under Tiberius into the abuses of that right by some of these temples. The result of that imperial enquiry was to confirm to the Phœnician shrines at Paphos and Amathus the privileges from which they had drawn great profits. (3) Diodorus tells us of the asylum of refuge for criminals and runaways at the temple of Melkarth, at Tyre. (4) Strabo tells us of that of Apollo, at Daphne. (5) On the coins of several Phœnician and Syrian cities are the records of their temple refuges, and (6) at the little Phœnician shrine called the Heracleum, at the fish-curing station on the Canobic mouth of the Nile, we see the representation of the actual tattooing of the sacred marks upon fugitive slaves, Lucian explaining to us that this custom prevailed through all the Semitic nations. (7) At the most ancient sanctuaries of the East fugitives had

only been safe while remaining within the temple precincts, but that restriction soon passed away, and the sacred mark came into vogue, its affixture on the body, in return for a fee, procuring safety for the wearer when he left the temple asylum, and enabling him to go abroad a free man. (8) In Palestine, the six cities of refuge were only for involuntary homicides, and were chosen out of the 48 sacred cities of the Levites. Prior to that arrangement, the right of sanctuary had attached to all altars, and the change was effected at a time when the local altars were being abolished. (9) In Greece, sanctuaries of refuge were many. All will remember that of Athena of the Brazen House at Sparta, where Pausanias was walled-up, and that of Hebe, at Phlius, where escaped prisoners and slaves hung their fetters on the boughs of the sacred grove and were safe thereafter (as we read) from all pursuers. This could only have been the case if some visible mark had become their warrant of protection. Then there were the refuge sanctuaries of Athena Alea, at Tegea; of Poseidon, in Calauria; and Poseidon, at Tænarum, which latter was only for Spartan slaves, helots, and oppressed Periœci; and eight other refuges of the first-class, whilst on a lower footing of privilege came the eleven additional sanctuaries of refuge. (10) In Rome, no such rights of asylum existed for centuries as had always been found in the East. The temple of Divus Julius was made an asylum by law, and was purely exceptional. And when Antoninus permitted slaves in the Roman provinces to fly to any temple or statue of the Roman Emperor's to escape ill-usage, we find no mention of a mark or of a fee.

(i) One more class to whom the sacred mark was supplied by the Eastern temples was the great class of the Gerim. The right of an alien stranger to live in a country not his own was for ages unrecognised. Then it

became a right of sufferance only, carrying with it not even the privilege of engaging in trade. We see this by Romulus—when needing population for his new city—opening a special temple-refuge for aliens between the two summits of the Capitoline Hill, and guaranteeing to such their safety, though only within the assigned precinct. We see it in the great numbers of the Gerim throughout Syria, Judæa, and Phœnicia. From an inscription found near Larnaca, we find, in the monthly accounts of a great Phœnician temple of refuge, that in the terrible centuries when people were flying to escape the ruthless Assyrian armies year after year, men sought shelter in stranger states, and in the refuge temples of these states made their offerings and payments, and, after being for a time fed and housed, were marked with the emblems of the god of the land, and had the word GER prefixed to their names (possibly branded also upon limb or forehead) that all might tolerate them. Numbers of these marked fugitives were in every country, and we find them, though “uncircumcized strangers,” employed in the temple service of the first temple at Jerusalem. It is fair to assume that the Jews, like other Semites, marked their tolerated aliens in body as well as name, since mere absence of the Abramic covenant-mark on the males would not suffice. Alien women, as we know, were held in special abhorrence by the law, and would need some visible sign of protection. Gibeonites, too, would need distinguishing from the unsanctioned heathen, and, though no image or unclean emblem would be branded on any, it is much more than probable that, by some visible device, Jahveh’s name was written on the foreheads of those whom he protected.

(d) OATH FEES, ORDEAL FEES, AND JUSTICE FINES.

(1) (a) In November, 1905, I showed you how largely

primitive man relies upon the sacred oath in his elementary code of justice. The oath and ordeal are, in fact, the entire *nisi prius* of the savage. But in the great civilizations of Chaldea and Egypt we find an equally universal resort to oaths. Only the priests could administer these, and they were generally taken at the small altar of incense before the statue of a deity. Mr. Johns says—

“In Babylonia, the judges gave both parties and all witnesses the oath before Shamash and Adad. Often one or more other gods and the king are sworn by. After Babylon became supreme, men swore by Marduk and the local gods also. . . . The oaths were administered before the censer of Shamash at Babylon, and at the shrine of Shamash in Sippara, or at Babylon sometimes before the emblematic dragon sculptured on the doors of the Marduk temple. . . . A kind of magical conjuration appears to have been employed. . . . In Assyrian times the oath was only occasionally in use. . . . In the later Babylonian times, we still find all parties and witnesses in law put to the sacred oath.

(b) The actual method of judicial procedure in ancient times is profitable to record here, as it serves to indicate further channels of revenue and profit accruing to the temples under the present head, and applies equally to Chaldean, Assyrian, Egyptian, and Semitic countries. The Babylonian judges were hereditary, and appointed by the priest-king for their lives. Occasionally they were even temple women. The elders of the cities, used as the official witnesses, were all temple officials or members of the guild of sacred votaries. Sometimes a judge gave the decision, sometimes the elders, Cæsar or Pompey being very much alike to the litigants. After selecting a judge and obtaining a day for hearing, the parties went down to the temple and resigned into the hands of the god the object of dispute, or the deeds relating to it. Hence, the decision ran as the “Judgment of Marduk in the House of

"Marduk," or so forth. In bringing suits in Babylon the parties appear to have gone by preference to the temple of Shamash, probably because the charges for oaths were there less exorbitant. In Assyria, the litigants bound themselves under oath not to disturb each other or litigate afresh after the decision, and this misconduct was penalized under heavy forfeits to the temple. In actions for failure of contract the penalties were payments to the temple of the nature of forfeits. Moreover, unsuccessful suitors not only lost their cases but were proceeded against at once by the temples for perjury and slander, the penalties for which offences were branding, or payment to the temple of a sum equal to that which the other party—had he won the suit—would have had to pay over. This of course was retaliation, but it was sacred finance, and we are enabled to judge how valuable a branch of the vectigalia were the penalties and forfeits-at-law springing out of administration of the sacred oaths. (c) In Greece, not only altars of incense, but all altars were used for the taking of oaths. At Sparta, the sanctuary of Athena of the Brazen House was resorted to. The oaths at all ancient temples were graded in power and in price, like those of modern Ashanti, and the "magical conjuration," shown above to have been used in Babylon, accords exactly with Ashanti practice, where oaths are taken over a fuming vessel called the "swearing pot," amid incantations from the fetish priest, and charged-for according to scale. The sale of justice in ancient temples and modern fetish-huts was thus effected with equal completeness.

(2) As with oaths, so with ordeals—those venerable institutions of priestly origin. The temple ordeals of all nations are now clearly seen to have been little else but a machinery for extortion of bribes, and faking of decisions in favour of highest bidders. We like to hug to ourselves

the belief that one temple and code may have been an exception to universal bribery and oppression at the seat of justice, but, although here and there in Babylon, Judæa, and Greece, a law-giver and hierarch set his face to do justice and love judgment, the Hebrew prophets leave us small doubt that in Israel and Judah the worst enemies of the poor were at the priestly judgment seats. The Athenians and Romans came nearest to modern standards of justice and equity, since by their laws legal procedure was gradually removed from altars and temples, and the administration of justice confided to the civil magistrates.

(3) But now let us look at the vectigalia from justice-fines. To save time we will confine this branch of our enquiry to Greece and Rome, in both which countries they were of two leading descriptions, though of many specific kinds.

First there were the *Civil* fines paid to temples. (a) In the early ages, both at Athens and Rome, the sacred pontiffs had exclusive possession of civil and religious law, and, down to very late times in both countries, magistrates and private individuals were alike bound to submit to any sentence pronounced by three chief priests, whose sentences were generally fines and forfeitures, or both. (b) At Athens and Rome, the magistrates and courts, and the assembly, frequently made the larger fines inflicted payable to some temple, giving notice to the temple functionaries, who proceeded to collect the amount. (c) At Athens, upon all fines received by the State, a tenth was reserved for Athena, and a fifteenth for the other deities collectively. (d) At Olympia, Zeus profited by all fines inflicted by the judges and civil administrators. (e) At Rome, so far back as 750 B.C., the primitive constitution allocated to the expense of the public sacrifices all cattle-fines paid by defeated parties in actions-at-law:

these "sacramenta" being levied on the unsuccessful litigants in proportion to the value of whatever subject of dispute was concerned. Later on, the fines were payable in money instead of cattle, and, as the expenses of public sacrifices increased, and the number of gods and temples multiplied, the sacramentum tax was (in 289 B.C.) made more stringent. (f) In Sparta, portionless orphan girls must be married by their next-of-kin, or portioned by him, and if he refused he was cited before the archon and fined 1000 drachmæ for the temple of Hera, goddess of marriage.

Then there were the *Religious* fines accruing to the temples. (a) The fines for "slight of the gods" are known to all readers of the classics. Æschylus in *The Suppliants* puts it:—

Due fine that man shall pay who slights the gods.

For judgment was not long in falling on the hapless man or woman who failed in frequent attendance at the temples with offerings and dues, and with vows to record and redeem. That soul should be "cut off from the congregation of Jahveh" too, as well as every other "congregation." The unlimited facilities for oppression at the call of a priesthood gave means for the effectual squeezing of defaulters, and there is evidence that in Chaldea, Palestine, Egypt and Greece, these were unscrupulously used for temple gain. Forfeit of lands and property, expulsion from citizenship, enslavement and helotry, too often mutilation or execution, were the terrors under which the crowds at festivals and sacred pilgrimages lay if they failed to "pay as they went," and the voluntary liberality so much urged in the sacred books of all ancient religions was practically ignored by the temples. (b) Next came the fines on priests and subordinates of the sacred staff. These officials were in all temples controlled by the chief priest, who sentenced his own defaulters; but the high

priest, or pontifex maximus, held jurisdiction over the priesthood for every class of crime and misdemeanour, and these dare not be taken before any civil tribunal. The revenues from fines on priestly evil-doers were not insignificant, and the item is found in Jerusalem, Egypt, Greece and Rome. (c) Then there were the crushing fines imposed on any who violated a temple sanctuary and escaped the death-penalty. Of numerous instances I will name but one. At Mantinea, in the temple of Athena Alea, is an inscription recording a list of debtors to that goddess. Among these appear thirteen named persons, with the amount of fine in each case, all of whom had been concerned in the pursuit of a young girl into the temple, and her murder within its walls. It is ordered that during the whole period of these heavy debts being paid off by instalments, neither the thirteen persons, nor any one of their families or *of their clans* shall be admitted to any temple—a prohibition too dreadful for modern religionists to adequately understand. (d) Of temple fines and forfeitures in appeal cases from elders and judges to the supreme court of the god, enough has already been said in paragraphs 1 (b), and 3 (a). This branch of fines-revenue, was a remainder from the ancient sole prerogative of justice attaching to the temples, the first deviation from which prerogative appears to have been the appointment in Babylon, Jerusalem, and Tyre, of “judges to sit in the gate,” with right of appeal to the high priest. The temple thus remaining the high court of justice, remained probably the entire recipient of the fees, fines, and forfeitures. (e) Fines for breach of sanctuary regulations were extremely numerous, and offences constantly transpired, often unwittingly by the parties at fault, for priestly codes were fearfully and wonderfully made. To realize adequately, however, the rapacity and tyranny of

temple procedure in these cases we need to transport ourselves to the East, to understand the Semitic and Asiatic dispositions, and to be familiar with ancient priestly methods. As the people rose to power this mis-used prerogative was placed under limits, and, notably in Greece, became shorn of half its ancient terrors. In Rome the civil power wisely held in its own hands the entire management of the temples, but in Egypt no reform came until the Koran and the sword effected a wholesome clearance of temples, codes, fines, priests and many other things ecclesiastical. Zeus, at Olympia, dared to fine even countries and nations for breaches of his regulations; and at one time Sparta, at another Athens, was ordered to pay over very large sums in coin under penalty of excommunication. Both paid up, and Zeus divided these particular fines between himself and the authorities of Elis. (f) Coming now to the fines for damage or trespass on tombs, it is a little odd to find these the only fines named as part of the Vectigalia Templorum in such a fine work as Smith's *Dictionary of Antiquities*. What is there said of them applies only to Rome, where their frequency is properly attributed to the belief that magic could be wrought by anyone effecting entrance into a tomb, as the Spirits would then receive the magic message and obey it. But similar belief in magic ran through every other ancient people, and in Egypt, notably, the extraordinary precautions to guard tombs from violation are the wonder of the world. In certain countries of old the cemeteries were, to some extent, under temple guardianship, but at Rome under public administration; and it appears as if the Romans, after wisely taking over their cemeteries, unwisely left all fees and revenue attaching to them to be still collected by the priests.

In Rome, several considerable temples were built and

endowed from the public fines. Take these four for instance :—

	Temple of	
496 B.C.	Ceres.	Out of fines inflicted by the tribunes.
296 „	Faunus.	Fines for rent arrears (ager publicus).
295 „	Venus.	Fines on matrons for adultery.
238 „	Flora.	Fines for rent arrears (ager publicus).

Livy tells us that the fines for rent arrears were paid by defaulting *pecuarii* (or graziers), who used the public lands without permission or payment for cattle runs, and the frequency of these fines, as well as the volume of their totals having been sufficient to build and endow two complete temples in sixty years, gives us an idea of the number of wandering cattle being driven about in Italy at that period: a state of things exactly similar to what Uztariz complained of two centuries ago in Spain.

The sale of pardons by temples was dealt with in my last lecture, but must be mentioned in passing as part of the *vectigalia* from law and justice procedure.

(e) BURIALS REVENUE.

(a) In the primitive communities of the ancient world, a sacrifice was essential before carrying any corpse to interment, but in Greece of Plato's time, that custom had apparently lapsed. (b) In a Babylonian poem, so ancient that quotations from it appear in documents of 4000 B.C., Gilgamesh and Eabani converse together after Eabani's resurrection from the dead, and he tells Gilgamesh that the condition in the after-world of the unburied dead is terrible indeed compared with that of the religiously buried. This indicates to us clearly that from the most ancient period religious ceremonies of interment were practised in Chaldea, ceremonies which in all countries and all ages have brought fees and offerings to the priesthood. (c) In Egypt, Greece, Asia Minor, and Palestine,

all persons in a house where a dead body lay, all who took any part in a funeral, or touched or went near a tomb, had to go to the temples and pay purification fees, and make offerings to the gods, before being allowed to again enter any sacred precinct. (d) On the second, ninth, and thirtieth days after a Greek funeral, sacrifices had to be offered for the dead in the temples, and customary offerings presented on each occasion. (e) In Rome, the same purifications must be paid for, and a sacrifice offered on the ninth day. (f) At the Floralia, in February, all mourners, and those bereaved during the previous and recent years, took flowers and food to the cemeteries, decked the graves, then went to the temples to be again purified, with more fees and offerings. (g) Libitina was the goddess of Roman funerals, and from the time of Servius Tullius the Roman registry of deaths had been kept at her temple, where all requisites for pious funerals were sold to the public in its immediate precincts. (h) At Hierapolis, in Syria, there was a sacred chasm going sheer down from the temple vestibule of one of the gods, and all truly religious mourners had to bring the corpse to be thrown down there "for a consideration." (i) In like manner there were, in Chaldea and Palestine, sacred places here and there, whereas, in the cemeteries of Egypt, the rich strove to be specially interred, so as to be regarded as holy dead, and obtain certain advantages they believed would accrue. (j) But over the greater part of the East, in primitive and in later ancient times, people were buried almost anywhere without temple interference, save that relatives and friends must go and be purified, and pay fees, and offer mortuary sacrifices after the burial. (k) In Egypt, on the contrary, as all the world knows, the people lived all their lives in preparations and payments for their deaths, funerals, and permanent tombs.

(1) They perpetually sacrificed and offered at the tombs of their relatives and ancestors, and joined temple processions, carrying the statues of their dead with them to perform rites and pay festival fees. (2) When their own deaths occurred, the sacred order of embalmers had to be paid to mummify the corpse, and other sacred orders to carry it for interment to one or other of the great temple cemeteries, paying fees at every stage. (3) The funerary priest must chant all the way, and burn incense about the mummy. (4) Arrived at Abydos, or some other sacred cemetery, the temple of Osiris must be visited, and offerings and sacrifices made, then the corpse taken across the Nile and interred, its statues being interred with it as I shall by and by describe to you. (5) M. M. Perrot and Chippiez (in their *History of Art in Ancient Egypt*) say—

All who could afford it gave their tombs a perpetual foundation. They devoted to the purpose the revenues of some part of their property, which was also charged with the maintenance of the priest or priests who had to perform the ceremonial rites. . . . Besides this, there were priests attached to each necropolis who, for certain fees, officiated at each tomb in turn, their services being retained much in the same way as masses are bought in our day (we may see them on the bas-reliefs at Sakkareh). The poorer Egyptians who could afford it purchased places in a common tomb where the mummies were heaped one upon the other, and confided to the care of priests who performed the funerary rites for a whole chamber-full at once. On the Casati Papyrus, mention is made of a priest who is charged to watch over IMOUTH, son of PETENEFHOTEP, his wife and children; MEDLEDK, the carpenter, his wife and children; PEPEE, his wife and children from Hermonth; the father of PHRATRIOU the fuller; APLOU, the son of the boatman, and his wife and children from Thebes; PSENMOUTH, the carpenter, his wife and children; PSENMONTHIS, the mason; AMENOTH, the cow-herd; all belonging to OSORVARIS. There are many more lists of the same kind.

(6) Then there were the statue fees. The more statues of yourself you had buried with you, the better for your KA,

or double, in the under-world. The more statues of yourself you could manage to get inside a temple, protected by its sanctity and its priest's vigilance, *much* the better for your KA. Twenty statues represented twenty chances more of survival to the double, hence, the number of private statues found in sacred enclosures was, in Egypt, very large. The circumstance of this right (to sanction statues in temples) being a crown right in Egypt, can only have meant that at one time or other the priests had overcrowded the shrines with statues in return for payment, and the pontifex (the sovereign) determined to assume the lucrative privilege to himself for the future.

(f) EARNINGS OF FEMALE HIERODULI.

(g) CHARGES AT SACRED GROVES.

These items were in a previous lecture only vaguely alluded-to, but are very important, and, in all those countries with which we are at present dealing, formed rich and stable sources of income to a large class of temples. Those who care to enquire into details will find them in every ancient history, in the holy scriptures, and in the pages of almost all the great classical writers. But I will say here that there were large numbers of Female Hieroduli in Chaldea, in respect of whom we have no proof, but rather disproof, that they served at the temples as courtezans. It seems even quite possible they became Hieroduli of the Babylonian gods of thunder and of the sun to escape compulsory service as courtezans of Ishtar. The order of vestal nuns at the temple of Marduk, in Babylon, and those at Sippara in the sanctuary of Shamash, had notable privileges, and their marriages (for they were eagerly sought as brides) were conditional on their remaining vestal unto death. The dowries they

brought to their temple-convents were returned to these ladies when they married, and their individual liberty and honour preserved to them through life by the laws of Babylon and every sanction of religion. The temples fed, clothed, housed, and maintained them; they bore high office on the temple-staffs; they and their properties became exempt from taxation, and the mystery is how they came to be an order at all, and why so many of the richest women joined them. They were by statute freed from the reproach of childlessness by means of an arrangement such as Sarai made with Hagar. With our present knowledge much is left to conjecture, but it is clear some financial benefits must have accrued to the temples in return for the privileges given these ladies, and some social or financial benefit been derived by their husbands. Putting together those two assumptions, we perhaps find a solution of difficulties in the inference that these vestals (of 2250 B.C. and earlier) were bought for large sums from the temple-convents on account of their bringing to their husbands certain titles, ranks, and privileges, such as only the rich could afford to pay-for, and Herodotus' much-derided story of the Babylonian marriage-auctions may have referred to this very institution. All the nuns would be eagerly competed-for, since even the poorest and plainest of them would bring to her husband these ranks, titles, and privileges, as well as exemption from taxation, and those most favoured in face, figure, and fortune would fetch the highest prices, notwithstanding the vestal clause of the contract. The temple-convents would clear such profits by their sale as might enable them to portion the less-eligible brides, whilst retaining a substantial balance for their treasuries. This, however, is, of course, all conjecture, and at present these Babylonian votaresses of Marduk and Shamash are a puzzle to learned authorities.

(h) PROFIT OF COMMERCIAL VENTURES.

I pass over, without detailed allusion, this branch of temple income. The decipherment of Babylonian and Assyrian tablets has given sufficient indication that the Chaldean temples kept trading-ships, and were interested in caravans. We have seen already that at their own great storehouses in all the mound cities, they sold and bought for profit, and their sacred enclosures were busy trade marts.

(i) REVENUE FROM GUARDIANSHIPS, ESCHEATS, ETC.

(a) At Athens, the temples undertook the guardianship of orphans and heiresses, their fees for this service being certain beasts for sacrifice (and a medimnus of meal and two gallons of wine) every first day of the month, and every seventh day of each tenth month. We need not suppose that this custom originated in Athens; it is far more probable to have come down from very ancient times, such guardianship having evidently been a feature of all Eastern temple administration. *(b)* The passage already quoted to you from the book of Maccabees establishes that sums in trust for the maintenance of widows and orphans were deposited with the temple at Jerusalem, and it is evident that loan-interest on such sums would not be regarded by any priesthood as remuneration for their fiduciary services. The facts at Athens, therefore, probably afford the key to an explanation of how such temple guardianships were requited. *(c)* Then there were the revenues derived by temples in all ancient countries from sacred escheats. *(d)* And of kin to actual escheats to the temples were such cases as the gift of King Cræsus to Apollo's temple at Branchidæ. To other shrines, this man of wealth gave prodigious gifts, but to Branchidæ he gave the whole escheated wealth of

the rival who had unsuccessfully contested his own claim to the throne. (e) In Rome, the property of all convicted or absconding traitors escheated to the temple of Ceres; and (f) that of Vestals who died intestate went to the temple of Vesta. (g) A similar custom is believed to have ruled in Ionia in favour of the temple of Diana, at Ephesus. (h) At Jerusalem, we see, by Ezra vii, 26, that certain confiscations were a part of the former vectigalia restored by Artaxerxes, in 457 B.C., to the rebuilt shrine of Jahveh.

(j) SALES OF PRIESTLY RANK.

In Egypt, under the old empire, this branch of the vectigalia must have been very lucrative. (1) Almost every other man of the upper and middle classes was a priest, whatever his actual and secular calling. The priesthood descended from father to son, and, as in Babylon and Assyria, carried with it exemption from taxation, and the right of being fed from the public stores. It is possible that in all ancient communities having cults of the so-called love-goddesses, women of property devoted themselves as courtesan priestesses to escape the large claims of the state, and ensure to themselves and their offspring a life-maintenance at temple expense. In Egypt, as in Chaldea, Phœnicia, and Armenia, every woman of noble family served as a temple courtesan. In their high class the temples of Hathor, in the rich and middle class those of Hathor or Neit, were selected for this infamous consecration. (2) As for the Egyptian men, having paid their initiation fees, and secured the priestly name and emblems, they next competed for the purchase of titles of priestly rank at the various temples, and one by one paid for further initiation through the various sacerdotal degrees until, after long and costly

expenditure, they attained to the title of chief priest. (3) We know from the inscriptions of Zeus-Amen's temple, at Meroe, how it was done. Says the historian, Heeren—

None came empty-handed to Meroe to adore. For the title of priest, which all sought, many gifts and offerings were needful. This dignity and its payments must be many time repeated before attaining the title of chief priest. It was bought for 15, 20, or even 30 pieces of gold. Makrinus paid 110 pieces for two titles; another, a talent (£1.420), and more. The title of under-priest was, at one time, 30 pieces, and chief priest 60 pieces; a kind of tax, in fact, arose, which men paid once or more, as they desired honours or grants from the temples.

(4) This system seems to have come down to Egypt from the more ancient temple-regime of Chaldea, where the social privileges conferred by a nominal priesthood, not to speak of its exemption from taxation and onerous public services, made its attainment a great object of desire. There, as in Egypt, the caste of the priesthood was hereditary after a man had once entered it, and the right to serve in certain temple offices was also hereditary. As these multiplied (says Mr. Johns), the members of the priestly families held office in turns for a short period of each year.

(5) I have not found any similar practice mentioned in the Greek authors, but in Rome considerable sums were paid *pro introitu sacerdotii*, the enforcement of such payments resting with the civil magistrates. Fees of a similar kind were also paid by subordinates on the staffs of the temples. They were themselves paid officials, but they paid entrance fees on their admittance to office.

(k) COLLECTIONS AND MENDICANCY.

Throughout ancient Syria, in connection with the worship of the Pessinuntine Mother of the Gods, there had

long been a system of wandering mendicants, something like the Bonzes of Tibet, begging for alms from house to house, and daily paying in their collections to the treasury of the temples. As the period arrived at which Greek interests became dominant on the seaboard of Syria, these mendicant priests became familiar with the Greek language, and, finding encouragement from the generous, easy-going disposition of thousands of colonists in the Syrian coast ports, soon took it into their heads to send some of their fraternity over to Greece, where the worship of Cybele had already secured a foothold. Then began the strange spectacle in the towns of Greece, of emasculated begging friars carrying images of Cybele on their backs, or on the back of an ass, and selling to all and sundry, in the open streets, the forgiveness of their sins and crimes for trifling sums of money, as well as undertaking, for certain payments, the grievous injury in secret of anyone that you might name. The system made so deep an impression on the masses, with its introduction of music, and banquets, and processional pomp, that other temples copied the entire paraphernalia, and in later Greece, Isis, Opis, and Arge all had their mendicant friars, and their house to house collections of pennies. Called Agyrtæ in Greece, these priests soon spread their system through Italy, and in Rome were known as Eruscatores. On certain fixed days of each year, in both these countries, the mendicants of Cybele collected pence at every house, and soon there were so many collecting for different temples and various deities that the authorities had to restrict the fixed days of collection to one per month. Even then, as Mommsen has shown, the great abstraction of ready money taken from year to year from the poorer classes of Rome for the benefit of foreign shrines, became a serious economic burden on the city, just as the swarms of mediæval friars

throughout England and Europe in the Middle Ages were an incubus on local and State finances.

(l) STATE PAYMENTS.

The resources of kingdoms and states in public taxation were often grievously misapplied by their assignment to temples. (a) The little shrine of Zeus at Piræus grew to magnificence through a tax of eight drachmæ levied for its benefit on every ship coming into that notable harbour—the port of Athens. (b) The Temple of Ephesus had a tantamount privilege, for it could sell exemptions from inward and outward customs duties to whom it chose in the port of Ephesus. (c) At Oropus, Sulla gave the temple of Amphiaraus all the Roman revenues of that town, port and district. And the list could easily be extended. (d) In Rome, besides those public lands whose yield was yearly assigned to the priesthood, many of these had regular salaries from the city and imperial treasuries. It was so with the Augurs, the Curiones, and the Vestals, and we may assume it was so with many others of the very numerous priestly bodies. (e) Public residences were maintained at great expense from the State funds for the Pontifex maximus, the Rex sacrorum, and the Vestal Virgins, whilst (f) under the Emperors all the priestly and vestal incomes were largely increased.

(m) SUNDRY OTHER REVENUES.

The temple receipts of ancient Greece, as well as other countries, were stained by the profits of piratical expeditions and the income from public brothels; whilst in Carthage, Phœnicia, and the more eastern countries the proceeds of dealing in imported slaves, the manufacture

and sale of eunuch boys, and bribes paid for the commitment of criminal violence, even of murder, occasionally found their way to the coffers of certain deities.

Far more material, however, than such corrupt and merely casual sources of income, more material, indeed, than any separate branch of the vectigalia, save the revenues from land and agriculture, were the financial advantages reaped by all ancient temples from their exemptions from taxation and public burdens of all kinds. (a) The dictum that "every exemption is a grant," was as true four thousand years before Christ as in the days of Gladstonian Budgets; and when we find at that remote date a large estate conveyed free of all taxes and imposts to Marduk of Babylon, and another to Eria of Elam, we know this meant that to such extent as these estates and their products would in ordinary course have been liable for State land taxes, irrigation dues, labour services, crop taxes, etc., or for city gate dues, market tolls, bazaar dues, etc., to that extent (not to mention military service), a heavy grant, tantamount to all these, was made to these two temples from the public resources. (b) In the code of Hammurabi (2,200 B.C.) we find that even death duties on a deceased father's property were not paid by the priestesses of Marduk. (c) In Egypt, from the most remote times, there had been absolute and entire exemptions for the temples and the priestly orders, but (d) under the Ptolemies, great changes were effected, and these privileges were extensively curtailed. Temple property, as such, became then liable to taxation, since it was found that as the temples had by that time amassed to themselves the greater part of all the landed and other property in the country, there would have been little left to tax. The shrines themselves were allowed to remain free of imposts, and the priests exempt from labour and military

services, but if the latter occupied and cultivated lands for their own benefit, they must pay all the usual imposts upon agriculture. (e) Under the Romans a certain fixed number of priests at each Egyptian temple were allowed exemption from the *Capitatio*, but several new taxes were levied upon the temples, the Emperor claiming, for instance, four per cent. on the value of all the offerings made to the gods, and requiring a due for the State upon every sacrificed calf, an assessment termed altar tax upon each temple, and other imposts called in Greek respectively, the *lesoneia* and *epistatikon*, the exact nature of which is not defined. (f) The inscriptions at Ephesus shew that in that great harbour of Ionia, the Temple of Diana had not only freedom from harbour and customs dues, inward and outward, on its own merchandize, but sold the like exemptions to individuals from time to time. A captain from Rhodes, for instance, receives exemption from all such duties, even his ship being made clear of ordinary port dues, and the grant includes goods bought for his family, as well as his ship's trading cargo. (g) In Greece, the temple authorities of Æsculapius at Epidaurus, on starting a colony at Astypalea, used what appears to have been their right in extending to this distant place their own immunities from taxation and imposts. (h) In a letter of Philip of Macedon (207-195 B.C.), the people of Abæ are assured that under his sovereignty the sacred lands of Apollo shall remain as free of imposts and charges as they had always previously been. (i) In Rome temple property and temple priests were exempt from all taxation. (j) So in Syria and Phœnicia and at Jerusalem, to which last shrine, in 457 B.C., Artaxerxes (in Ezra vii, 24) specially restored by charter the freedom of its "priests, Levites, singers, porters, nethinims, and ministers, from toll, tribute, and custom."

My task is for the present ended, and I thank the Society for the patient interest with which it has accompanied me in these researches. Some devotion has been needed in the process of gathering together, from classical and archæological sources, the multitude of facts I have had the privilege of setting before you, and arranging them suitably for that purpose. In the course of their elucidation we have all learned much about the countries and peoples with which our enquiry has been concerned, as well as about their temples and religious faiths, and I trust to have succeeded in convincing all of my hearers how deeply interesting are these ancient themes, and how well worthy of one's devotion to them of literary leisure.

THE MYSTERY OF MATTER.

BY REV. E. A. WESLEY, M.A.

FROM an early period, more than six hundred years before Christ, when the human mind first awoke to a sense of the mystery of the universe, men have speculated off and on about a supposed primitive matter out of which they have imagined the many and varied objects of nature have been formed. These pioneers of philosophy were hardy speculators, unencumbered by those elaborate tests and checks which modern scientific men employ in their search for that truth which ever hides beneath the appearances of things, for they reasoned inexactly by analogy, evolving their wonderful systems in large measure from their own consciousness. Nor were they embarrassed by the teaching of their predecessors and contemporaries, arguing perhaps that one man's thoughts were as good as another's.

Yet even among the fragments of these early systems that have come down to us, some sort of progress may be discerned, especially if we will consent to seek, in the light of modern knowledge, rather what these sages meant than what they said; for at this remote period the language of philosophy had not yet been separated from the language of poetry and rhetoric. In this enquiry we may follow the example of the experienced schoolmaster, who reads the mind of the child not merely by his answers, for the child's language rarely expresses with precision his thoughts, but by an intuition acquired through experience of a reasoning faculty working rationally behind a faulty expression. Viewed thus, the progress of thought amongst the pre-Socratic philosophers becomes clear. Yet this

progress though real was slow, so slow at times as to be almost imperceptible, rapidly gaining momentum however so soon as the experimental method began to supersede the method of empiricism.

Before proceeding to the consideration of modern theories of matter with which this paper deals, it will be wise to examine briefly these earlier theories of Greece, their later developments in Rome and Alexandria, the modifications that they underwent at the hands of the schoolmen, until we reach the more scientific theories of more modern times.

What men thought about matter in prehistoric days is of course unknown to us. The earliest record of human speculation on its nature is to be found in the reputed sayings of the early classic philosophers. Thales, the first among these sages, thought that he had discovered in water the inner heart of matter, since water pervaded everything, mounting from the sea to the cloud, dropping from the cloud on the land, filling the rivers and returning again to the sea in an unending circuit.

But the mind of man is of such a quality that it can never rest content with any conclusion, but must push its quest still further, seeking as an English poet has said:—

The goal that is not, and ever again the goal.

Anaximenes, a follower of Thales, thought the foundation of matter must be something more subtle still. What really happened to the sea, he said, was that its waters passed into air. There was consequently an element more refined, more searching, more widely diffused even than water. The basis of matter was air.

But Heraclitus, who followed Anaximenes, pushed the question still further back. What is it he demanded that turns water to air? Obviously heat; consequently fire,

and not air or water is the really universal principle or common property of all forms of matter. But heat, unlike these two elements, is never still; by nature it is perpetually in motion. The matter therefore of the universe is not static but dynamic. Matter and motion are inseparable.

Next came Empedocles, harmonising and completing the systems of his predecessors. Grant, said he, that water, air, and fire are principles in universal matter, why leave out earth, the most obvious of them all? Here you see we arrive at the "Four Elements," so familiar to our fathers—earth, air, fire and water.

Have we arrived then at our goal only to find it is not a single goal but four? No, said Anaxagoras, there is and must be an unifying element behind these four. Left to themselves they could not build up an orderly cosmos. There must be the Divine wisdom who, out of these four, builds up the world. Thus having reached at length the origin of all things, it is clearly impossible to go any farther. But it is still open to the philosopher to dispute the lower members of the series, or to interpose an intermediary, and this is what Democritus, the founder of the atomic theory, proceeded to do. He said:—

Your four elements are only forms of one primitive and uniform substance. Behind them all lie the atoms of which they are composed. The uniformity that you ascribe to the will of the Divinity, and his infinite wisdom, is the law of the atom. All matter, whether subtle or gross, whether fire, earth, air or water, consists of atoms, and these atoms obey a common law. They gravitate towards each other in vertical lines. From their prescribed path they can never swerve. What they do they must do. The laws of the universe are settled beyond any possible modification or divergence. Man is but a part of this fate-governed universe, and is like it subject to necessity.

Now if there is one settled belief in the heart of

unsophisticated man, it is, that whatever may be the case with matter, mind is free. How then can mental freedom co-exist with material necessity? Here Epicurus comes on the scene, who, as Cicero quaintly observes, watered his little garden at the fountain of Democritus. "Supposing," he says, "your atoms act as you say in vertical lines, is it not possible that some of them may slide a little edgeways, and so give excuse for a modicum of freedom to the human will?" Cicero makes Cotta deride this explanation as partaking of the nature of a dodge. It would not have occurred even to Epicurus, he said, if he had not had an axe of his own to grind; and I think most of us would say Cotta was right.

It is a curious thing how little the earlier philosophers troubled themselves about the position of man in the universe. Epicurus, indeed, seems the first to have given that matter serious thought. Undoubtedly, man in any rational scheme must have his place. If we put him among the atoms, and subject him to the law of necessity, his freedom is lost. This is the difficulty Epicurus felt which made him appeal for a side-long motion for the human atom.

By the time of Plato the distinction between man and the world he inhabits is more clearly recognised; it is the distinction which the Germans have taught us to call the difference between the ego and non-ego. But on close examination the ego breaks up into parts. First we have consciousness which is the heart of the ego, and then what the ego is conscious of. Presently we find a third member appearing, for the ego does not rest passively viewing external phenomena, but begins spinning out of them that wonderful cocoon we call his thoughts. Similarly the outer world on closer inspection ceases to appear simple. All its various appearances sort themselves into classes.

This is what struck the early philosophers who made out the scheme of earth, air, fire and water. Beside that, however, there is a more fundamental distinction—that between the thing as thought of in itself and its appearances. In that sentence I have brought together the ego and the non-ego. I said: “As thought of in itself.” For in considering the world around it is impossible to make anything out of it except by bringing into it a mental element. The appearances of things are all that our mind directly knows of things. But the mind is not satisfied with the appearances, it wants to reach the reality. To reach that it adds something to the appearance.

Let us make this matter quite clear. The conscious ego is the workman, appearances are the material, thoughts are what he makes of them. Now in the process of making up these thoughts the workman has to postulate some underlying essence which he calls reality, something which imparts to appearances that notion of unity which makes an object real. We know that our dreams are not real, and that many of our thoughts are not real. But even these are made to look like real by assuming that they have this underlying something. So whether we stick to the plain testimony of our senses, or make up a visionary world of our own, we are equally compelled by the laws of our being to impute reality. Now we are getting on the confines of metaphysics, and metaphysicians when they descend to the level of ordinary people, always tell us to think of an orange.

Let us think of an orange. It is yellow, round, soft, sweet, and so on. These are its qualities or accidents. It might be green, sour, and pear-shaped, and yet be an orange. Now you possess five senses, and each gives you a different account of the orange, and you believe them all. How do you know that they are speaking to you of the

same orange? May there not be five oranges—one a colour orange, another a taste orange, another a touch orange, and so on? No, you say, there is one orange. What makes you say there is one orange? Experience, you reply; I have found out that the orange I see and smell is the orange I touch; moreover, it does not occupy five places, but one place. True. But do yellowness, sweetness, softness and roundness occupy space? No, you say, these are merely my sensations of the something that occupies space. Well, that something is the mental imputation of unity. It is the *substantia* of Aristotle. The colour, touch, and smell, are the attributes of the *substantia*. They are not essential to it, they are its ornaments, the signs if you will of a hidden thing underneath, which as it were support and keep them together. These accidents are subject to change, but the *substantia*, although it may shrivel up as the orange contracts, will continue to occupy space so long as the orange exists. How do you get your notion of a space-occupying substance underlying these accidents? Not from touch, or at least not from touch immediately, for touch conveys the feelings of roundness, and softness, which are not the same things as the space-filling property of the object. Indeed, the question how we get our knowledge of space is one of the profoundest problems of philosophy. Emmanuel Kant traced this instinctive tendency of the mind to unify the testimony of the senses, and to focus them on a space-filled centre, to the fundamental unity of all unities—the unity of the self-conscious mind, which he thought projected itself into the various attributes of the object, and made them one, just as among the many and diverse thoughts of the brain we are able by a similar self-projection to create order and unity. Now whether this is so or not, this distinction between substance and attribute

is one of the most useful and abiding in philosophy. You can only doubt it if you doubt the reality of the external world.

Indeed, if you take up this extreme position and deny *in toto* the reality of external existence, the necessity of assuming a substratum to appearances remain the same. The only difference is that for a unity of things you have substituted a unity of thought. The appearances of yellow, sweet, soft, and round have no meaning, even as thoughts, until they receive this unifying principle. Space is not essential to the idea of the substantia; all that is necessary is its power to present the many as one.

Many years later, in what we call the dark ages, when the inroads of the barbarians had swept away alike both schools and schoolmasters, Radbertus employed this Aristoteleian doctrine of matter to explain the change of the elements in the Eucharist, insisting that the alteration was effected by substituting one substantia for another by what he termed transubstantiation, a change which later on the schoolmen, in strict accord with this conception of the function of the substantia, declared took place "*non localiter*."

The problems that occupied the learned world during the middle ages were mainly theological. When, however, Gerbert of Aurillac introduced into Europe the scientific writings of Aristotle, by mean of Moorish-Latin translations from the original Greek, many men of learning, especially in the Franciscan order, began to turn their thoughts from the well-worn paths of theology to the problems of the physical sciences.

Roger Bacon, a Franciscan friar, whose discoveries in optics have made his name famous alike in history and legend, was but one of a devoted army of scholars who abandoned the disputations of rival schools of theology for

the surer ways of experimental science. With admirable patience these pioneers of science investigated the problems of matter, unsystematically, as one might expect, without knowing quite what they were about, finding here and there a stray truth, and guessing often at what they could not prove. They invented instruments for weighing and measuring, for distilling and melting intractable substances; discovering methods of assay, learning to recognize metals, to distinguish acids from alkalis, accomplishing in the methods of laboratory practice more than in the region of actual discovery.

To an eager speculative mind, like that of our English Sir Francis Bacon, the processes of experiment as practised by the alchemists appeared irregular and interminable. But the ways of science are, and ever will be slow, step by step, here a little and there a little. Only on rare and happy occasions does she make a long forward stride, when some pregnant discovery opens up to her a new vista. Bacon thought the delay was due to the hampering use of the Aristotelian dialectic. In this he was certainly mistaken. The syllogism is merely a test of truth, not a method of discovery. Every discovery made by the alchemists, or anybody else for that matter, is the result of an inductive process, though that induction sometimes may have been little better than analogy. The method of the alchemists was right, but the progress made was slow, partly because the experimentalists were bewildered by the vastness of the field, partly because the circumstances of the time rendered the clear recording of their discoveries and their failures a matter of danger. Like the cuttlefish, that ejects ink to hide itself from its pursuers, these early experimentalists concealed their discoveries in a cloud of verbiage, hinting at things that were not, to veil things that were. All that they really valued they im-

parted privately to their pupils, all that was worthless they set out at large in pedantic language in their ponderous and empty volumes. They wrote with the Inquisition before their eyes. Even when the Reformation freed the dwellers in certain favoured lands from this ever-haunting dread, the suspicions of witchcraft were still abroad, and it behoved them to be wary. There were charlatans, too, amongst the alchemists, who traded on the greed and incredulity of the age, promising what they never meant to perform. This arrogant posturing and ignorance offended Bacon. "Let us have done with this fooling," he said, "and get to work." Unfortunately, Bacon laboured under two delusions; he thought himself a man of science because he was interested in science, and he thought he had discovered a new method of reasoning, when he had only recognised as logical a form of reasoning that was contemporary with the birth of mankind. As a scientific man, compared with Gilbert, whose discoveries in magnetism he calls fairy tales, because they passed his powers of comprehension, he was a babe in the nursery. The inductive method he imperfectly understood, and still more imperfectly applied. It was not a *Novum Organum* certainly, nor was his notion of its application practical. The field he laid out for inquiry was too wide, hence the singularly slender influence he exercised on his contemporaries. To carry out the vast conceptions of Bacon would have required a great government bureau of science and an army of workers. Not that way did the path of discovery lie. Each man for himself in the old fashion laboured at the little problem that he had set himself to solve, without relation to the work of his neighbours. Knowledge is advanced by the isolated acts of the many, seldom by collaboration. Knowledge is a patchwork quilt, made up of many irregular scraps, toilsomely

stitched in by many hands without any known pattern or design. We are always pulling it to pieces and making it up again as we get new ideas, and so it comes about in time that some sort of pattern is evolved. Bacon's way was to set thousands of men to work, under the rule of a heaven-sent genius, himself by preference. It was a gorgeous scheme, but it was not practical. The men of his day saw that, if we do not, and I think not unwisely went their own way. For them the *Novum Organum* might have been an old almanack for any practical use it might possess.

The *Instauratio Magna* did not afford its author opportunity for speculation concerning the nature of matter. René Descartes, who was born thirty-six years later, supplied this deficiency, falling, however, into a curious mistake, which an acquaintance with the history of Greek philosophy would have enabled him to avoid. To him matter, which Heraclitus so rightly had taught is in perpetual motion, appeared as static—motionless. The error is the more to be regretted because it led Spinoza into that engulfing fatalism which characterises his whole philosophic system. It was in revolt against this static view that Leibnitz advanced his singular theory of monads. Fixing his mind definitely on matter as always in motion, he came to think of every group of atoms, every aggregation of molecules, every collection of material particles, great or small, from the tiniest crystal to the mightiest planet, as a centre or vortex of forces. This view modern science has largely verified.

The so-called theory of monads is rather an illustration than a positive theory. It rests on the observation overlooked by Descartes, that every definine aggregation of atoms is a centre of force. It is the ancient Heraclitean doctrine—the idea that all things flow—but it is the idea.

supplemented by the dominating thought of Anaxagoras, that all this perpetual flux of things is subject to the guidance of a Divine power. Leibnitz perceived that, without some pre-established harmony, some heavenly scheme or ordering, a moving universe must inevitably accomplish its own destruction. Leibnitz is a Platonist. His heavenly archetype of the visible creation works out its course in things seen and temporal.

Far removed from Platonism was the view of Bishop Berkeley, that most interesting, wayward, and delightful being, whose consummate English style recommends a system of philosophy to later centuries that has never won for itself a single whole-hearted disciple. Starting with the extreme nominalistic position that general ideas have no counterparts in the visible world, Berkeley boldly attacks the Aristotelian dogma of substance and accident. Substance, he says, is a dark, lifeless, inert mass, possessing no functions at all but the paltry task of upholding a set of attributes, not one of which corresponds in any essential respect with its supposed counterpart. Such an amorphous fossil should be extirpated. Instead of this fictitious substantia and accidents, he said, let us admit frankly that yellow, round, sweet, soft are mere images of the mind, with no actual counterparts in any possible object. Let us acknowledge that the properties in the object which they represent are unknown and unknowable. All that we can rationally assert is that certain unknown causes produce certain known effects. God has so ordered it. Through the mysterious environment of man He reveals Himself as the author of the divine harmony of the world. Matter is impossible, he says, unless you assume a Divine Being revealing himself to the mind through the images of sense.

Under such a scheme the notion of matter undergoes a

curious modification. Yellow, round, soft, sweet appear as sense impressions, emanating from unknown attributes. These properties are no longer supported, as Aristotle taught, by a material substantia, but by a Divine essence. Berkeley thought by this system to abolish general ideas, but he did not do so. For the general idea of substantia he substituted another general idea—the Divinity. That is the essential weakness of his system.

From this highly speculative theory we turn to the investigations of more practical philosophers. Sir Isaac Newton showed that matter, in all its forms, obeyed a common law; that the force which caused the fall of an acorn was the same that retained the planets in their circular orbits around the sun. Less conspicuous, but for practical purposes more useful, was Dalton's later discovery that specific units of matter (which, under his theory, were regarded as indivisible atoms) united chemically with one another in definite and fixed proportions, which could be numerically expressed, a discovery that laid the foundations of modern chemistry; while later investigation has proved that chemical affinity and electric attraction are one and the same.

So far we have dealt exclusively with inorganic matter. But organic matter is matter just as much as inorganic. We must ask, therefore, whether life introduces any fresh element? On a superficial view life seems to possess a power of disintegration and reconstruction, and the earlier biologists accounted it therefore a special form of force. But more careful examination has shown that life is not a force; that it cannot, of its own power, disintegrate or reconstruct a single particle of matter, nor yet create or destroy it. Neither can it accelerate, retard, create, or destroy any of the forces which operate upon matter. What it can do, what it is constantly doing, is to direct or guide

certain of the natural forces into new channels, causing matter to assume new forms characteristic of organized substance.

Joule and others have demonstrated that the physical forces that act on matter are all co-related, and that they can pass into one another, what was motion becoming heat, and what was heat becoming motion; that heat, and, in fact all the physic forces have a precise mechanical equivalent. This implies that force, like matter, can neither be increased nor diminished, whether by the conflict of the physical forces or by the interference of life.

The mention of force in the preceding paragraph raises the question of the meaning of that common word. The ancient philosophers believed that matter and force always went together; that matter could not exist without force, nor force without matter. Locke and many others have regarded force as merely a name given to motion, and motion as a property of matter which may or may not be present in any given body. Different kinds of force meant to thinkers of this school different kinds of motion.

The discovery of the conservation of force, to which I have just alluded, of the indestructibility of force and its metamorphoses, naturally led to a conception which forms an integral part indeed of the synthetic philosophy of Herbert Spencer, that force is a real entity associated with matter, but quite independent of it. This view was immensely strengthened by the observation that force could operate through what then seemed absolutely empty space. Light, for example, which reaches us from the most distant stars, if it be a form of force, passes through countless millions of miles, where, so far as then appeared, matter did not exist. If we could look upon heat, electricity, and light as fluid substances, the presence of

matter in the interstellar spaces would be an obstacle to their propagation rather than a help. But that idea, though once generally entertained, has long been abandoned. Were heat, light, or electricity fluid substances, it would be difficult to understand how they could pass into one another. Still there remains a difficulty. How can these forces propagate themselves at all, whether through matter or through empty space?

We can imagine a ball thrown through empty space continuing its course until it encounters something to stop it, but the travelling of a force is quite another matter. We cannot even think of a force dissociated from matter. How then do forces travel, for travel they certainly do? To take a familiar example: we heat a poker at one end, and presently find that the other end has become hot. How does the heat find its way from one end to the other? To answer that we had better take a simpler case. Suppose instead of heating the poker, we strike it at one end, the blow will be felt as a vibration at the other end. How does that vibration find its way through? The particles struck apparently begin to swing to and fro like a pendulum, agitating those next, and setting them in motion also until all the particles to the extreme end are set swinging. This is the undulatory or wave theory of the transmission of force. A moment's consideration will show that a force that spreads throughout any given substance by setting the particles swinging, must come to a stop when there are no particles to swing. How then can light find its way to us from distant stars if there is no matter between us and them? There must be matter. What then is that matter?

Now we know that matter can exist in at least three distinct forms, as a solid in which the particles are near together, as a liquid in which they are further apart, and

as a gas in which they are still further apart. But between the particles of solid, liquid, and gas there is space, and if that space is empty, no matter how violently the particles may swing, they cannot set others in motion unless there is something between them all rendering them practically continuous. This substance cannot be a gas, since that consists of finely divided particles with spaces in between. The substance we want, to explain the transmission of force through matter, must fill all things, it must be a plenum, a perfectly continuous homogeneous interpenetrating something, very much like a solid yet very different. In some sense it must be far more rigid than cast steel, yet it must be so very fine that no gaseous film can be more rare. To this strange inconceivable substance the name ether has been given. No one has ever seen ether. Its presence may never be demonstrable by experiment, yet for all that it may be a mathematical necessity, and the only imaginable substance that can make motion thinkable.

To explain the transmission of force through matter therefore, we are obliged, it would seem, to imagine an incomprehensible ether, in other words, to get out of one difficulty we launch ourselves into another.

Let us look, however, more closely into the picture presented to us by this theory of matter. There are atoms immersed in ether which interpenetrates them in some mysterious way. These atoms are at certain distances apart, and they affect one another if they do so through the ether which acts as a bridge. But what about the atoms? Are they actually, as their name suggests, irreducible things? Dalton assumed that they were, as Democritus had done many ages before. Modern chemists too have shown that, whether indivisible or not, they act as if they were indivisible, uniting with one another,

separating and re-uniting as definite units. But this they would do if, instead of being little solid unbreakable bits of stuff, they were arrangements of vastly smaller things, acting together, and banded together not by physical continuity but by physical forces, as the members of a solar system are bound together around their sun. Viewing matter thus, we find less difficulty in comprehending that mysterious porosity of it which has been revealed to us lately by the discovery of X and other rays. These strange emanations pass through solid things, as if they were as thin as air. How can they do this? If you think of these rays as undulations of ether and not as substances, and think of solid substance as composed of particles immersed in ether, and as far apart relatively to their own dimensions as the planets around our sun, such transparency becomes quite easy to understand. But how in that case are we to explain the solid feeling of material things when we touch them with our hands? Why do these things which are so porous to rays seem so dense and resistant? This difficulty may be explained in two ways. We may imagine that the particles are in violent motion. Now we know that bodies in motion affect our organs of sense in quite different ways to bodies at rest. A column of water may be discharged from a pipe so rapidly that it acts like a solid, indeed, like a very hard solid. Such a stream may be forced from the pipe so fast that if a blow be given it with an axe, instead of cutting through the stream, the axe is violently repelled and rebounds as if the water were a bar of solid steel. If the particles of which a body is composed, though really far apart from one another, are in violent motion, they, too, we may suppose, act as if they were close together. That is the first explanation. Again, to take the other explanation. We know that a very rapidly moving object leaves

upon our eye an impression of continuity, as when, for example, a spark of fire is rapidly whirled round it appears like a curved line of continuous light. The reason for this is that the moving image of the spark leaves an after image on the eye which is not at once obliterated, so that we see the spark in many places at once. This defect of the eye is common to the other senses, so that the apparent solidity of really porous substances may be due to the after image left by the particles in motion.

These explanations seem reasonable, although they will receive a slight modification when the movements of bodies are regarded, as they are by the more recent theory of matter, as strains in a continuous form of matter rather than actually moving particles. Before we come to this, however, it will be well to ask ourselves what we actually know about the minute particles of matter? Their substantia makes them units. What are their attributes? Beyond all question they possess two qualities; they possess mass and inertia. By inertia we mean that if stationary they will continue stationary, and if in motion will continue in motion, unless they are acted on by some outside force.

It is true we have never seen these atoms, and never shall see them. They are far too small for that. No microscope can possibly reveal them. All that we know about them we know from the action of millions of them brought together in some mass that we can see, weigh, measure, and experiment upon. But we are sure that the properties that belong to the mass are to be found also in the atoms that compose it, and in the still smaller particles which, from the porosity of matter, we think actually compose the atom. If matter in bulk possesses mass and inertia, so must every part of it. What is true of the whole must be true of the parts. Let us enquire whether

there is any *other thing* besides matter which possesses just these properties, because, if there is, the great probability will be that the two are either very closely related or fundamentally identical.

Now experiment has disclosed the fact that electrical force possesses exactly these two properties, mass and inertia. At first sight nothing seems more dissimilar than matter and force, or to express it in concrete terms, than the wire and the electric current that runs along the wire. But we must remember that the wire is not the solid thing we take it to be. It consists of particles far removed from one another, immersed in the ether, in which and by which they are bonded together, so that in the aggregate they appear to our senses as a solid wire. Forgetting appearances then, and trying to get at reality, we ask What specific difference is there between the electric current and the matter it travels through? The difference cannot consist in the ether which is common to the two, nor in the qualities of mass and inertia, which are also common. And here comes in the new conception. May not these particles of matter be really the same thing as the elements which form the electric current? If they are both strains or stresses in the ether, for all their apparent difference they may be at root identical. Those who think that two things which are apparently in every respect alike are identical, infer that matter is electricity, and electricity is matter. If we adopt that theory we had better cease calling the organized constituents of the atom by a name that would imply materiality. The new name given them is electrons. We must amend also those two explanations we give for the apparent solidity of matter, the water that appeared like a solid, and the spark that appeared a continuous ring. We must abandon the notion of a succession of moving bits of matter, and substitute the

idea of a succession of strains or pressures acting on the extremity of our nerves with such rapidity as to suggest a continuous strain or squeeze.

We will now reconstitute our mental image. Imagine that you have magnified matter so enormously that what seemed a continuous surface breaks up into tiny electrons, relatively as far apart, considering their size, as the planets in the solar system; that each such system constitutes an atom, and that there are millions of these atoms, each an independent system of electrons. But as you know, these atoms cling together with great tenacity in nature, you must suppose that there are also multitudinous streams of free electrons passing between the aggregations we call atoms, bonding them together. Furthermore, that groups of atoms (all, remember, composite things but acting together as units) are also affected by streams of free electrons, and bonded into secondary groups by what chemists call residual affinity. This will enable you to understand that chemical force is really electric force, which is one of the most certainly ascertained facts of modern science. But if we say this of chemical force, shall we not have to say the same of all forces? Clearly we shall, if we are to be consistent; all are fundamentally ether strains and nothing more. A strain may be a stationary or a moving strain. When a train moves over a bridge it sets up moving strains. If it comes to rest the bridge is still strained, but the strains are stationary. Motion is a change of strain. A moving electric charge or strain is called a current. If we accelerate, retard, or deflect a current, ether waves are generated. These waves are strains in motion, and the wave front presents the properties of matter, mass and inertia. It is these pressures or moving strains that convey to our senses the feelings of matter. All the sensible attributes of matter

are due to electric waves generated in the ether striking on the nerves of eye, ear, and so on. This in brief is "the electric theory of matter." We are told by masters of science that it is a theory that has worked, and that will work. It has a future before it.

But there is another side to this. Granting it possesses many good properties, how does it look from the high ground of philosophy? Will it work there? What are its philosophical merits and defects?

Unquestionably, the theory clears up many difficulties and simplifies many problems, but it does this mainly by elimination. They call this in Germany throwing away the baby with the bath water. The ether-stress theory throws away a great quantity of dirty water, but I much fear the baby disappears with it. What we really care about most is not the relative positions of electrons, but their effect on us as intelligent human beings. If these electrons, which seem so simple they can all be described in a word, present to the mind of man the aspect of beauty, order, colour, sound, the splendour of sunsets, the glitter of sea beneath the morning sun, and, more than this, the myriad wonders of humanity, we want to know how they do it? And if the physicists should reply that it is not their business, we may rejoin with justice they have thrown the baby away. These are the very things we want to know, and if the physical world only offers us the raw material out of which humanity has built for itself this fascinating structure of human thought, we turn from the physical world disillusioned. She is but the artist's colourman, who provides merely so much burnt umber, orange, and carmine, the pigments, the palette, and the brushes. We have been in the habit of looking to nature for inspiration; but if all she can offer us are ether-strains, out of which the creative spirit of man is to paint

a world of splendour, of death or of life, why, the centre of gravity is changed. The world counts very little, and the soul counts more. Philosophers of all ages have reminded us that things are not what they seem; that nature gives the real, while man receives only the appearance; but if nature does not even give the complex with its real, but only ether-strains of major or minor magnitude, variously arranged, why then, so much more credit to the mind that can make of such simple elements a palace of beauty for itself. All our interest in that case passes from the objective to the subjective. I am aware that we have been placed by other theorists in similar predicaments before. Bentham brought us there with his soul-depressing theory of happiness—he reduced us to mere automata. That was an attack from within. Spencer landed us in a like quandary by his resolution of all things into matter, force, time, and space. But even in the narrow limits of the synthetic philosophy there was room for an elaborate psychology. Now we have a theory which sweeps into its net not the exterior world only, but our bodies and our brains. Thought becomes an ether-stress; and as ether, under the new theory, is the only real matter, thought becomes material, and every imagination of the heart of man, that is not an ether-strain, is thrust into a supersensual region to account for itself as best it may. The theory gives us these electrons—restless, ever-moving—these ether-strains in the universal matter, and tells us that the human nerve system, its ganglions and its brain, is but a scrap of this universal matter. Hitherto we have considered our brain as a private manufactory of our own, in which we distilled thoughts. But now the factory is demolished. Yet our thoughts go on. Where then is the workshop in which we turn ether-strains into poetry, music, and art? Clearly we are flung back into that vast

unknown region we call the world of the spirit. If so, does it not seem that the real and the appearance should now change places? That the real is the spiritual world, where all that is noble and enduring is wrought, and that the natural world, with its mad wild whirl of electron-strains in universal ether is the dream?

Out of sand grains you can only build sand castles. Out of ether-strains only ether castles. Give to your sand grains an infinite variety of properties, and you may build out of them what structure you will. Give these electrons infinite variety, and out of their combination you may construct a living, throbbing, breathing, lovable world. But every step towards that simplicity, that negation of variety which fascinates the man of science, is a step into a sterile Sahara.

This is the first philosophical reflection suggested by this novel theory. It robs the world of matter to enrich the world of spirit. That is not a fault, but it is a confession of inadequacy.

At present, however, the theory is in itself more than a little sketchy. It is in the embryonic stage, waiting to be born; still in the darkness, with immature members and organs; it is not a full developed organism. We must remember that, for it would be unfair to expect of it that perfection of form we demand in a scientific theory. Admitting this, however, there may be still such inherent defects of principle as may prevent it ever assuming the perfection of a philosophical theory, however useful it may be in science.

The foundation of the theory is the existence of ether. This may be a uniform, continuous, infinitely extended substance, or plenum filling all space. That is one view of it. But if it is a plenum it is not composed of particles, but is, if we may so say, a universal atom. In that case

there can be no movements in its own intrinsic substance. What movements take place within it must be the movements of bodies or forces that are on some different plane of existence, and of which neither it nor they are mutually conscious. There can be no stresses, strains, or moving centres in such a body. This theory of the constitution of ether will not, it is obvious, meet requirements. If there are stresses in it there must be movements in it, especially if those stresses are moving centres of strain. Therefore, ether must be made of particles, vastly smaller than electrons, particles either in motion or rest, kept in position by inherent forces. Between these particles there must be empty space. That brings us back to our old difficulty. Ether was the substance invented to abolish empty space, and here it is again. We want another still finer ether to fill in these spaces, and so we may go on for ever.

Nor does this bring us to the end of our difficulties. We are told that the electron is a minute electric charge, a charge highly concentrated and of great power; but we are told also that this charge is far less powerful, far less concentrated than that of an equal portion of ether. Relatively, therefore, to ether, these electrons are centres, not of electric charge, but of the comparative absence of charge. They are like rarefactions in the ether. Instead of being centres of stress, they are centres of comparative easement. What induces these centres of comparative slight tension to yield up the energy they possessed as simple ether, and what becomes of that lost energy? The theory throws no light on that. Given these centres of reduced ethereal energy, why do they move? If the whole body of ether is shrinking, why is not the contraction uniform? Why does it take the form of electric currents? These currents being electric charges in motion, how is

their course varied? What is that which accelerates, retards, or deflects their course, giving rise to ether waves or stresses of negative quality? The theory gives no answer to any of these enquiries.

Such shortcomings have characterised other theories of matter. Herbert Spencer imagined the whole universe to have once been occupied by matter uniformly distributed; that we were now passing through a period of contraction, in which matter was consolidating into concrete substances; that when the whole had become one mass a process of disintegration would ensue, which would continue until the original state of equal dispersion had been attained, when contraction would again set in, and so on for ever and ever.

In the foregoing paragraphs, and in an earlier part of the paper, we have frequently used the word force without defining it. What is force? If it is merely motion it is a property of matter, it is a quality, just like yellow, soft, sweet, round, all of which modern physical science declares are modes of motion. Tyndall wrote a book entitled *Heat considered as a Mode of Motion*. Now motion may be used as an adjective, or it may be used as a noun. Used as an adjective you say a moving body, and as a noun the motion of body, meaning the same thing. But they are not the same thing. Moving is the effect, motion (in the sense of force) is the cause. A similar confusion occurs in the use of the word electron. Electron is the name given to an electric charge. You are told also that an electron is an ether-stress. But the electric charge is the cause, the stress is the effect. Again, a charge in motion is called a current, and when such a current is accelerated, retarded, or deflected, it gives rise to ether waves. These ether waves are described as moving electrons. But the waves again are the effects, the current

being the cause. These waves are modifications of the ether produced by something. That something is force. That force electrical. By no means can you get rid of these two elements, the thing acted on and the thing acting, the cause and the effect, or, as we say in popular language, matter and force. We can say that force is a property of matter, since we cannot conceive of matter without force. Can we reverse the proposition? Can we say matter is a property of force? That is what the physical science teacher appears to do. He therefore calls his theory the electrical theory of matter. That means that matter is resolved into electricity, or matter into force. But this, philosophically speaking, is a blunder. Matter is not resolved into force, for the real matter is the ether, of which the electric charge is an attribute. What has been done is to identify the appearance of matter with electrical phenomena, which is a totally different thing. Our sense organs, that convey to us these appearances, are deceived into thinking that moving electrons or small charges in motion are solid objects. The sense organs confuse appearance with reality. But the *real* in the theory, the true matter, that which takes up room and is the substance supporting the attribute of motion, is the fundamental ether.

Taking, then, ether as the unexplained material substratum, what are its attributes? We have said already, motion. But what motion? Electric motion, magnetic motion, mechanical motion. These are sometimes stated thus—electric current, the magnetic field, and mechanical motion. These three vectors act perpendicularly to one another, and wherever two exist the third springs into being, and they correspond to the three dimensions of space—length, breadth, and thickness. View these three vectors as movement in matter, and you regard them as

attributes of matter. Ask what is their cause and you are thrown back for answer on some other entity which you call force. If the fundamental electricity of the ether is the sole fountain head of force, then all three are modes of electricity. Even if we rob the ether of mass and inertia to bestow them on force, the ether still remains the real matter, as distinct from force as the earth's mass is from gravitation.

Corresponding with these three forces of the non ego—electrical, mechanical, and magnetic—there are three forces in the ego—memory, will, and reason. Memory is the force that records sense and other impressions. Reason is the force that co-ordinates and arranges these elements, constructing out of them an ideal world, partly corresponding with the external world, or rather its appearances, and partly distinct and aloof. This faculty for rational grouping we sometimes denominate imagination. Will, which is the third force, is the directive element, making man an influential factor in the world.* If it were not for these three forces it is doubtful whether we could in any way whatever come into touch with our environment. But these three powers are distinct from consciousness, which is the real mind-basis of the man. Thus you see that in man there is for the ether basis his consciousness, for the electric, magnetic, and mechanic force, his memory, will, and reason. Man is thus a microcosm of the universe.

To conclude the whole enquiry, we see that the ether-strain theory does not account for matter, but only for its

* Regarded thus the Newtonian laws of motion have their counterpart in the world of mind. With regard to the first and second law there is no difficulty. The third law of motion states that to every action there is always an equal and contrary reaction. The reception of sense-images in the memory is the action. Will is the reaction. Wherever two forces exist the third springs into being, therefore reason mediates memory and will.

appearance to the organs of sense. That it is utterly inadequate to account for the nuances, the delicate shades and varieties of sense impressions, all of which are necessarily relegated for their origin to the ego. Finally we have seen that the real matter, re-named ether, is fundamentally distinct from force; matter is just as inexplicable as it was before, force just as mysterious. The value of the theory lies in the order it brings into a number of hitherto uncorelated subsidiary phenomena. Its value is in the main scientific, not philosophical.

The mystery is still unsolved. We have briefly surveyed the field of speculation on this great problem from Thales to Lord Kelvin, a period of some 2,500 years. The progress made in the elucidation of subsidiary problems* during the last fifty years has been far greater than that attained during the long period that preceded. Yet we may well ask whether we are really much nearer the final solution. The more we know, the wider seems the field of our ignorance. We have learned to reject many errors, we have dimly learned some few half truths. Let us frankly acknowledge that they are half truths. The path of humility is the path of wisdom. The moment we think we have reached the horizon there is revealed another beyond. It is like looking up at the midnight heavens.

Stars in the sky, fold upon fold of stars,
And still beyond those stars, those gulfs of air
Flecked soft and pale with milkier stars beyond.

We seem to reach the very last and final, when beyond that star floats into sight a far faint blurr, that blurr is a universe. So with our theories of matter; we think we

* Some of them of great scientific importance, *e.g.*, chemical affinity, latent valency or residual affinity, electrolysis, the phenomena of the continuous and bright-lined spectra, and probably the determinate forms of crystals.

have solved the last mystery, that the quest is over, when out of the dark steals up another star, and the quest begins anew. So it has always been, so it will ever be until

The cloud-capped towers, the gorgeous palaces,
The solemn temples, the great globe itself,
Yea, all that inhabit shall dissolve.

Until things seen and temporal merge into things unseen and eternal. Then perhaps we shall find the secret out. Yet, after all, who knows?

WALTER PATER.

By T. L. DODDS.

THE nineteenth century, it cannot be doubted, was singularly rich in writers who, though not quite of the highest rank in literature, were men of wide culture, and were well qualified to explain the real meaning of those intellectual and moral ideas that in the aggregate make, or enter largely into the making of, modern civilization. Chief, perhaps, of this band of introspective and highly-gifted critics, that is, critics in the wider sense of the designation, was the late Walter Pater. Endowed, as we shall discover, with a highly æsthetic temperament, and moulded in mind by long association with an old university, he opened up new views in regard to the art, philosophy, and literature of bygone days, and fashioned for himself a style perfect in its finish and thorough adaptability to the purposes of æsthetic and literary criticism. I venture to think his books are well calculated to impress themselves upon the imaginations of all who wish to understand the soul of a book and the atmosphere in which it grew up, and who love really good writing.

Pater's books are so pre-eminently personal, and are so largely the result of temperament and training, that a brief account of his life naturally forms the preface to a study of his writings.

Pater was born in London in 1839. His family was of Dutch extraction, his father was a doctor of medicine, and, as medical men usually are, a man of considerable culture,

though this fact could not have had much direct influence upon young Pater, for his father died during the childhood of the son. At the age of fourteen the boy was sent to King's School, Canterbury, a circumstance that had an abiding influence upon his life. The daily association with an ornate church service, and with the rich old architecture, were among the formative influences of his life. It is on record that he was not an interesting youth; he was somewhat idle and backward in school work, not even evincing an interest in games, though this somewhat harsh estimate of Pater is subject to some modification when his habitual shyness is taken into consideration. As he advanced in his teens his idle habits dropped off one by one, and it was noted by those who knew him that he had, after all, more than average ability, and it was said that he would in one way or the other make his mark upon his age. A chance meeting with Keble—the poet of the English church, and father of the Tractarian Movement—awoke in Pater the dormant religious asceticism of a peculiarly artistic nature, a nature singularly susceptible all through life to the influences of music, architecture, and painting, and at the same time innocently sensuous beyond that of most men. In his eighteenth or nineteenth year he read Ruskin's works, and, needless to say, these great books, *Modern Painters*, *The Seven Lamps of Architecture*, and *The Stones of Venice*, books revolutionary in spirit and aim, and written with unequalled splendour of style, had a great influence upon the mind of Pater. He began to realise that there was beauty both in nature and in art, and that there were possibilities in the realm of prose expression never before dreamed of by himself. In his later years Pater repudiated Ruskin as his master in both criticism and style, and it is true that the younger man did fashion for himself both a system of art criticism

and a method of expression quite unlike those of Ruskin; but for all that, I am inclined to think, if there had been no Ruskin, there would have been no Walter Pater for us to discuss to-night.

In the year 1858 Pater entered Queen's College, Oxford, and here again his surroundings, medieval architecture, and the life of an old university, met his craving for æsthetic culture in its highest manifestations. He worked assiduously at the classics, steeping himself in the spirit of humanism, though he was never considered to be a great scholar. In 1864 Pater was elected Fellow of Brasenose, and this was, with odd breaks, his home for many years. His duties were light, leaving him with a fair amount of leisure, which he employed in methodical reading, and in the writing of essays, which were at first read to friends, and, after revision, published in reviews. Many of these first studies were on ancient philosophies, and though immature in the light of Pater's later work, were efforts to work out for himself a system of belief which was in part pagan, and in part Christian. Plato was, from the first, Pater's master in this line of study, and the great idealist in philosophy reappears in every page that our contemporary has written. Goethe, with his intense humanism and passionate thirst for knowledge, came next to Plato in authority over the mind of Pater. Under the inspiration of these two master-spirits he was slowly feeling his way to a definite philosophy of beauty, and to a sensitiveness to the real meaning of art, in a word, to the soul beneath the form of expression used by the artist. One result of this line of study was that Pater for a time ceased to be a high churchman, and approximated to Unitarianism in belief; but this was a passing phase of thought that disappeared with a growing familiarity with Italian art.

Pater's habits were exceedingly simple. Two small rooms for many years were sufficient for his wants. If any friend had suggested to him the expediency of taking to himself a wife, possibly he would have written a beautiful essay on the subject, but it is unlikely that he would have gone beyond the process of self-commiseration, as the sex which has vanquished most of us had no influence whatever over him. He never married, and his trips abroad were generally taken in the company of one of his sisters. His friendships were few but select; he preferred as his companions types of character that answered to his own tastes. Among those friends it is interesting to note were Miss Mary Arnold and Mr. Humphry Ward, a young Oxford don, destined to be her husband, Edward Caird, Bishop Creighton, Swinburne, and others.

Pater's habits all through life were those of the student, I mean the student in the real sense of the word. He retired early, though he was but an indifferent sleeper; in his wakeful moods he is said to have read through the whole of the *Dictionary of National Biography*. He was always accessible and pleased to see callers. He was a delightful companion, though not a brilliant talker. We are told by his biographer that he never fell into the bad habit of taking afternoon tea, nor, may I add, into the infinitely worse habit of smoking. He worked in the morning and corrected in the afternoon, and then did a little work in the evening. He lectured with regularity, but without distinction. He was exceedingly fastidious in his choice of books; only the great writers, distinguished by style, were read by him. Plato and the Bible were his daily companions, and it is doubtful if a better selection could be made by any one desirous that his life should be associated with lofty thought and divine precept. Pater cared little for the literature or the movements of thought

and of action belonging to his own day; he lived mainly in the past, and was absorbed, perhaps unduly absorbed, in his own work.

In 1885, the year of the publication of *Marius*, Pater settled in London, though he still preserved his connection with Oxford. He was now famous, but he never varied his quiet student habits. He travelled, as had been his wont, in France and Italy, patiently and lovingly studying the paintings and architecture that these countries contained. In 1893, finding that living in London was distracting, he settled entirely in Oxford. A friend describes him as he appeared in this, the mature period of his life:—

One would have said that there was a kind of placid piety, an inner content which somehow manifested itself in him. He did not talk a great deal, yet always enough. What I think struck me most about him was a sort of gentleness in his whole manner. . . . He was a very familiar figure with his pale face, strong jaw, heavy chopped German looking moustache, tall hat, and apple green tie. He was often seen walking, and latterly he rather laboured in his walk, which gave, rightly or wrongly, the idea of suffering.

In 1893 he had, for the first time in his life, an illness, and in the following year a still more serious illness. On July 30th, 1894, he died suddenly, of heart failure, in his fifty-fifth year.

This brief epitome of the main incidents of Pater's uneventful life must serve as an introduction to such consideration of his writings as the limited time at my disposal will allow; and, met as we are for the purposes of study and inquiry, it has seemed to me that if I attempted some system of classification and explanation of Pater's books, our evening together might not be altogether wasted. I will, then, begin with the books that deal with three great movements of thought, beginning first of all with *The Renaissance: Studies in Art and Poetry*.

In the preface to this book Pater explains what he conceived to be the real nature of art criticism.

The objects with which æsthetic criticism deals—music, poetry, artistic and accomplished forms of human life—are indeed receptacles of so many powers or forces; they possess, like natural elements, so many virtues or qualities. What is this song or picture, this engaging personality presented in life or in a book to me? What effect does it really produce on me? Does it give me pleasure? and, if so, what sort or degree of pleasure? How is my nature modified by its presence and under its influence? The answers to these questions are the original facts with which the æsthetic critic has to do; and, as in the study of light, of morals, of number, one must realise such primary data for oneself, or not at all.

The æsthetic critic then regards all the objects with which he has to do, all works of art, and the fairer forms of nature and human life, as powers or forces producing pleasurable sensations, each of a more or less peculiar and unique kind. This influence he feels, and wishes to explain, analysing it, and reducing it to its elements. To him, the picture, the landscape, the engaging personality in life, or in a book, *La Gioconda*, *the hills of Carrara*, *Pico of Mirandola*, are valuable for their virtues, as we say in speaking of a herb, a wine, a gem; for the property each has of affecting one with a special unique impression of pleasure. Our education becomes complete in proportion as our susceptibility to these impressions increases in depth and variety. And the function of the æsthetic critic is to distinguish, analyse, and separate from its adjuncts, the virtue by which a picture, a landscape, a fair personality in life, or in a book, produces this special impression of beauty or pleasure, to indicate what the source of that impression is, and under what conditions it is experienced.

The personal relationship between the critic and the work before him is the one that governs Pater's method of interpretation of art and literature, and we shall find as we proceed that, whatever the subject, the temperament is the interpretative force to be employed.

The first essay in *The Renaissance* volume is a

delightful study of the first premonitions of the French Renaissance. Renaissance, Pater defines, as

the name of a many-sided but yet united movement, in which the love of the things of the intellect, and the imagination for their own sake, the desire of a more liberal and comely way of expressing life make themselves felt, urging those who experience this desire, to search out first one and then another means of intellectual or imaginative enjoyment, and directing them not merely to the discovery of old and forgotten sources of this enjoyment, but to divine new sources of it, new experiences, new subjects of poetry, new forms of art.

It will be noticed that this definition passes over the usual historical explanation of the great revival of learning in Italy, and goes right to what the author conceives to be the heart of the animating principles of the Renaissance. In the essay I have just named, Pater discovers in France—and I think it was the first time the suggestion had been made—in the architecture of the thirteenth century, in those wondrous buildings in which men expressed the intellectual and the spiritual ideals that were moving within them, the signs of a coming revolt against superstition, and an intellectual revival. The carved and fretted stone is reflected in the love songs of the Troubadours, and the same language is repeated in the romantic love of Abelard and Heloise. It is the revolt of the affections against the bonds of ecclesiasticism. Rescuing it almost from oblivion, Pater finds in a love story, written sometime in the thirteenth century, the same tale of a revival of the great passions of human nature. The story is that of the loves of Aucassin and Nicolette. The tale is told partly in poetry, and partly in prose, and, in the hands of Pater, it is made to express the joyous simplicity of a long departed age, in which lightness and gracefulness of fancy travelled slowly up to a more vivid apprehension

of the meaning of life. In the search after the pleasures of the imagination, the French were carried beyond the bounds of the Christian ideal, but it was for the ultimate good of the nation that the love of the body and of the intellect combined, should overleap the narrow conceptions that theology had imposed upon the people. This pure humanism, this readiness to sacrifice the Hebraic to Hellenism was a marked characteristic of Pater's earlier writings.

In *Pico Della Mirandola*, Pater explains what he conceives to have been the mission of the Italian Renaissance. It was to

reconcile forms of sentiment which at first sight seem incompatible, to re-adjust the various products of the human mind to each other in the many-sided types of intellectual culture; to give the human spirit for the heart and imagination to feed upon, as much as it could possibly receive belonging to the generous instincts of that age. The Renaissance was great by what it aspired to do, rather than by what it achieved. It was for a later age to effect a reconciliation of Christian sentiment with pagan literature, but, with the fifteenth century, the only possible reconciliation was such as could be effected by the efforts of artists steeped in Christian sentiment.

Nothing, so Pater avers, that has ever interested the human mind can wholly lose its vitality. A civilization that had a living influence upon thoughtful Greeks could not but assert itself in the lives of Christians, and it was therefore inevitable that Pico, a scholar, a Christian, a restless searcher into the deep things of life, gentle in speech, and pure in heart, should come under the influence of the thought that had moved the minds of kindred souls in Athens in 400 B.C. Such a scholar is a type of the blending of the two streams of knowledge and belief. Elsewhere he says:—

Still, the broad foundation in mere human nature of all religions

as they exist for the greatest number, is a universal pagan sentiment, a paganism which existed before the Greek religion, and has lingered so far onward into the Christian world, ineradicable, like some persistent vegetable growth, because its seed is an element of the very soil out of which it springs. This pagan sentiment measured the sadness with which the human mind is filled, whenever its thoughts wander far from what is here and now. It is beset by notions of irresistible natural powers, for the most part ranged against man, but the secret also of his fortune, making the earth golden and the grape fiery for him.

. . . This pagan worship, in spite of local variations, is an element in all religions. It is the anodyne which the religious principle, like one administering opiates to the incurable, has added to the law which makes life sombre for the vast majority of mankind.

In the *Essay on Botticelli*, Pater explains with rare insight the characteristics of that great artist's work. It is deep meditation and great refinement in contrast with the simplicity of treatment of Giotto and his followers. The influence of Dante and Boccaccio is seen in the imaginative range of the work of Botticelli. He is a practical painter, blending the charm of poetry with the charm of line and colour. With exquisite charm Pater explains how subtilty and skill go to the making of those wonderful Madonnas and children that look out upon us from his pictures with that reverence and devotion that I am afraid are dying out of the minds of Protestants. In the work of this great Catholic painter there is a blending of thought and religion in its moods of devotion and exaltation. Botticelli has conveyed to us a peculiar quality of pleasure; he has his place in general culture, and can only be interpreted by those who have imbibed the true spirit of culture. He has the freshness of the dawn, and the uncertain and diffident promise which belongs to the earlier Renaissance itself, and makes it perhaps the most interesting period in the history of the human mind. In

this, and an *Essay on Leonardo da Vinci*, Pater still further elaborates his theory of art criticism. Briefly and bluntly stated:—Art is the expression of the beauty discovered by the imagination; the real business of art is simply the giving of pleasure, and has nothing to do with goodness of life, except such goodness as may be the result of the contemplation of noble ideals. The highest form of art is music or harmony, and the highest form of literature great poetry.

The *Essay on Winckelmann* describes a youth almost overwhelmed by poverty, and with no intellectual stimulus in his surroundings, but with an innate perception, such a perception as that which Keats possessed, of the perfect beauty of Greek art, and with a passion for the ideal in intellectual life. The youth, renouncing the pleasures of life, joined the Church of Rome, in the hope that he might secure the assistance that would enable him to visit Rome. This desire was gratified, and for years he devoted himself to the study of the antiquities only to be found in the centre of Latin Christianity. Winckelmann was murdered at Trieste by a fellow traveller for the sake of some art treasures that he had in his possession. In Winckelmann Pater discovers a type of character like his own in many ways. The substitution of a definite philosophy of life in place of the uncertain pursuit of metaphysics, the realisation of life with its blitheness and repose, were ideals common to both, and this affinity of soul enabled Pater to act as critic and interpreter of his German brother. In this essay he considers all religions as steps in the progress of the human mind, and therefore philosophically true.

In this fine volume of essays which I have very inadequately explained, Pater is at his best. His judgments are clearer than elsewhere, and his style has an ease and

blitheness that he did not quite preserve in his later writings. But the general tone is sceptical. With Pater the mind does not soar beyond the earth; sufficient for humanity are the creations of art and literature. But in general estimation, *Marius the Epicurean* is his chief work, and the one by which he is best known. It is his longest book, and the one on which he spent most time. He began it in 1878, and finished it in 1884. As an imaginative effort it excels by a long way any other work of his, and it is the clearest exposition we have of Pater's philosophy of life. Let me utter a note of warning: it is not a story, rather it is the delineation of the philosophy of a soul. It is a purely imaginative portrait of a meditative young Roman of the time of Marcus Aurelius. It begins with the boyhood of Marius, with its happy school days, into which a fair education, not divorced from religious instruction, was dovetailed. His father had long been dead, but his devout mother trained her only child in the best traditions of the simple old Roman faith, faith mainly in the immortality of steadfast honourable living. Marius' school days are spent at Pisa, and there he forms a friendship with Flavian, a brilliant, but pleasure-loving youth. Adolescence is followed by a period of intellectual awakening and of inquiry into the why and wherefore of things. It was a time of general unrest. The northern barbarians were pressing Romeward, and at Rome a condition of general distrust and instability had taken the place of the once strong, steadfast reliance upon themselves of a people hitherto the rulers of the world. The old beliefs were openly ridiculed, general scepticism had taken possession of the minds of public men, and all idea of public morality had wellnigh vanished, a condition of things not unlike that which prevailed in Paris just before the outbreak of the French Revolution.

The toleration extended to Christianity in Rome had favoured its extension, and had opened the way to some knowledge of its principles. Numerous forms of philosophy, as was natural in this period of doubt and perplexity, appealed to the man in search of a faith, or fraction of a faith, that would give him some assurance that he was not as the beasts that perish.

The most popular of the faiths abroad was the Cyrenaic, the author of which was the contemporary of Socrates. The leading principles of this creed were that, since all knowledge is limited to the mind, there can therefore be no knowledge beyond that which we perceive; it is also denied that there is absolute certainty on any matter of mental philosophy; it follows that pleasure and contentment ought to be the chief aims in life. This was the starting point with Marius, but we shall find that he soon travels beyond this easy-going scepticism to a more positive attitude of mind. Nay, I repeat that in Marius we have the expression of the philosophy of life held by Pater himself. As I said at the beginning, his books are largely autobiographic, so far as his beliefs are concerned. In the *Renaissance*, his position was that of mild scepticism, believing that all religions were equally true. The eye and the imagination were the determining influences upon the life of the individual. They opened out the world of beauty to the human mind, and offered perfection through the love of beauty. In Marius, beauty, with its attendant pleasure, is not sufficient, fullness of life can only come through sympathy with others. In this there is progress toward a system of morals greatly in advance of the earlier philosophy of Pater, and gradually, as we shall find, there is some approximation to practical Christianity. But to return to the story of Marius. His school days are ended, and he must bid good-bye to Pisa,

not the Pisa that we know, a city of old memories and decaying palaces, and of quaint old-world streets, but then a busy maritime port, teeming with new ideas in trade, literature and philosophy. Marius, much in the fashion of a youth destined for the civil service now, had been educated for employment in the household of the Emperor. He parts affectionately with his mother, whose tender solicitude for her only child, thrust out, so to speak, thus early into the unknown, is singularly akin to that of the Christian mother under like circumstances. The journey to Rome is delightfully described by Pater, showing that he had the eye of the poet for the beauties of natural scenery. Not less charming is the description of the sensations of Marius as he finds himself in the presence, for the first time, of the external symbols of the greatness of Rome. In the midst of temptation he does not forget the story told him by his mother. It was that he carried a white bird in his bosom, and that he must see that the lovely plumage of the beautiful creature was not soiled, so that at the end of his life it shall escape his custody without stain of any kind. That bird is the soul within his breast. On the journey, Marius had met Cornelius, a young Christian knight, and from him learnt, for the first time, the story of the new faith that was disturbing the peace of many families in Rome.

Marius takes up his abode in the palace of the Cæsars, and is soon in the presence of the Emperor and his household. The calm figure of the philosophic ruler of Rome, Marcus Aurelius, impressed him from the first. There was an air of aloofness, of old worldness, altogether unlike the traditional bearing of the strong forceful men who had guided the affairs of the imperial city. The charm of the Empress, in contrast to the sinister rumours abroad, the beauty of the one child of this singular couple, and the

affection lavished upon him, with no foreboding of the awful career that has made the name of Commodus a by-word in history, make up a picture, drawn with a delicacy of colouring, showing that Pater was an artist of the first order.

Marius hears the Emperor discourse on the vanity of human ambitions, and he listens for the first time to an exposition of those great principles of Stoicism which were in contrast to the morality then prevalent in decadent Rome. He waits on the Emperor in the Senate, and writes on his tablet those political maxims applauded, but never practised, by the senators. He follows his master to a gladiatorial exhibition, and notes that he is busy with affairs of state, and takes no interest in the barbarous amusements in which the people delight, and so, for the first time in his life, Marius has before him a concrete example of Stoicism, and the self-renunciation of the Emperor is, with Marius, the finger pointing to a higher ideal of conduct. Slowly, very slowly, the youth feels after the unseen; he becomes, though he does not know it, a theist. In the throes of this intellectual ferment of both heart and mind, Marius visits, in the company of Cornelius, the home of Cecilia, and is deeply impressed with the order and piety of that Christian household. He is taken to see the graves of the Christian martyrs, and the quiet confidence and serenity exhibited by these worshippers of Christ make a deep impression upon the mind of the pagan, or half-pagan observer. Here is a peace of heart that he has hungered after ever since the end of his school days. Can it be that the God of this people is the deity that he is in search of. A voice has been calling to him while (and ever since) he has been wandering wistfully through the streets of Pisa, and is this the voice that has spoken assuringly and lovingly to these people, and will

the same voice speak to him in accents that will set up in his heart a like serenity? This chance visit to a Christian home brings about a complete change in the spiritual outlook of Marius. He becomes from that time infected with the enthusiasm for humanity, a phase of mind unknown to the pagan world; but, beyond this, he experiences somewhat of the inward joy that lighted up the countenance of Cecilia. Spiritual emotions new to him awake to life, and remind him that he is in a new world. He attends the burial of a Christian child, and notes that with the sorrow there is a strange joy born out of a living faith in the resurrection of the dead. Slowly, but surely, Marius draws nearer and nearer to this new faith, but whether at the hour of martyrdom he was fully convinced of the truth of Christianity is not made quite clear. The reader of this strange story is not surprised at the denouement, or partial denouement; and from the first it is expected that Marius will find his final home in the new faith. It was an axiom with Pater that great souls foreshadow in their lives their own later history, and prognosticate the approach of coming changes. This is the peculiar mission of great and abnormally sensitive natures, and it was so in the case of Marius. The story has little plot, and there is not a love episode in it; the feminine is happily absent, and all through Pater strikes a grave note as though he were speaking in terms of confidence—the confidence of self-revelation—with his hearer on matters that concerned his own soul.

In style, *Marius* has not only a place of its own in English literature, but it has a place apart from the other writings of Pater. There is the note of gravity already mentioned, a note that imposes restraint upon the style. The sentences are at times a little involved, as though Pater had some difficulty in expressing the exact shade of

thought that he wished to put before his reader. There are no sharp cut phrases that lend themselves to quotation, and anything likely to startle is carefully avoided. But the weird music is never for a moment absent, though I am bound to confess, remembering the pleasure with which I read Newman's *Callista* several years ago, that the music at times is mournful, and not like the clear and stirring poetry of Newman's style.

Pater began *Gaston de Latour* soon after he finished the writing of *Marius*. The first five chapters were published in Macmillan's *Magazine*, 1888, and a sixth in the *Fortnightly Review*, but the work was left unfinished. The framework of the story, that is if we can assume there was any plot at all, is the struggle between the Catholics and the Huguenots of France in the sixteenth century. In many respects it is like the story of *Marius*. It opens with a description of a boyhood: it follows the unfolding of an impressionable mind from one stage of belief to another. Gaston, after a happy boyhood in rural France, decides to become a priest, and is received as a neophyte into the church. Soon he becomes a page in an episcopal palace, and learns something of the great world outside of his own country home. During a holiday period he reads the poems of Ronsard, and a new world of beauty dawns upon him. He realises the music of words, the sensuous beauty embodied in these old French songs. The poetry of every day life comes into view, and with it that humanism, which was unknown to the church. The poet who opened out quite a new world of thought and feeling to Gaston, was a friar, living not far away. Gaston, and his companions, in the true spirit of hero worship, had sought out the priest-poet whom they found, like a bishop of primitive times, digging his garden. The poet humours his youthful worshippers: he brings forth his humble art

and literary treasures, but more important still, he gives them a letter of introduction to Montaigne. Gaston makes his way to the château of the famous essayist. Pater draws a vivid portrait of the easy-going, sceptic essayist, whose ideals were not those of the eager lad in search of an abiding faith. But the pleasant talk, homely wisdom, and tolerant qualities of Montaigne prevail over the disgust in the mind of the pious youth at his agnosticism. Later, Gaston sits at the feet of Bruno, a pantheist, who taught him that God the spirit had made all things indifferently, with a largeness and beneficence, relieved of any theory of restrictions. "Touch! see! listen! eat freely of all the trees of the garden of Paradise." Here was the final council of perfection. This coarse advice repelled, as coarseness usually does, a refined and truly artistic nature.

If Pater had lived to finish this beautiful story, it is probable that Gaston would have found rest to his soul's wanderings in a return to the same church from whence he had set out in the quest of his golden grail of truth. The style of this book is simply perfect, and this makes the regret all the keener that Pater did not live to finish the beautiful story, which probably would have shown us the great writer returning to his earlier beliefs.

The slight volume of *Imaginary Portraits* has a distinct place of its own in our literature. In this strange book Pater selects some notable figure, and then imagines the temperament and environment, with their reflex influences, upon the individual. He endows his imaginary characters with tastes and passions as the outcome of æsthetic associations, or changed conditions of life, rebuilding as it were anew the character of the man.

A Prince of Court Painters is the story of a country artist who goes to Paris in search of wealth and fame. In the journal of a young girl, who follows with loving

interest the career of this painter, Antony Watteau, we learn the influence of Paris upon the temperament of the country artist: the restless energy, the fitful striving after perfection, and the absence of satisfaction with himself. Pater, as was his wont, interweaves with the life of the artist his own philosophy and view of life generally. And he accomplishes this with great delicacy of feeling. He interprets and represents French provincial life with, so it is said, rare fidelity, not perhaps the fidelity of the observant traveller, but the fidelity of the student, able to extract from French memoirs the precise shade of thought they yield to the artist critic.

Denys l'Auxerrois is a curious study of a half madman, half genius—a nature without balance—and yet one that dominates and infuriates the minds of his fellow-workmen, Pater writes:—

With a wild gift of divination he could detect the scent of rain from afar, and would climb with delight to the great scaffolding on the unfinished tower to watch its coming over the thirsty vine-land, till it rattled on the great tiled roof of the church below; and then, throwing off his mantle, allow it to bathe his limbs freely, clinging firmly against the tempestuous wind among the carved imageries of dark stone.

Denys is in the end, and after many vagaries, torn to pieces on account of his reputed habits of sorcery. And with gruesome art the death of this wild man of genius is graphically described. This essay, or biography, is not pleasant reading, but it shows that in this art of temperament reading, the imagination of Pater was sufficiently plastic to compass the entire circuit of the morbid and fantastic side of human nature.

Sebastian van Storck is a delightful study of a young Hollander, endowed with a rich and beautiful nature, who becomes infatuated with the philosophy of Spinoza, and,

like the great thinker, is eventually detached from the orthodox belief that stood for much in Holland at that time. In love at first with a beautiful girl who returns his affection, Sebastian in time, and under the spell of unbelief, ceases to love, and flees from home and kindred. He seeks refuge in a lonely house in a remote and desolate part of Holland. The land, during a period of storm, is inundated, and Sebastian is drowned while in the act of saving a child, who is found alive in his arms. I have not been able to divine the *motif* of this story, unless it is intended to be a warning against the undue absorption in intellectual pursuits.

Duke Carl of Rosenmold is a story of a German, athirst for the culture of the Renaissance, but who was without that breadth and strength of mind that would enable him to take in without mental disturbance the subtle spirit of the great intellectual upheaval. He dies ignominiously, the victim of a neurotic temperament—a type of many of the predecessors of Lessing, Herder, and Goethe. This remarkable volume describes four distinct types of character, all anticipatory of coming changes, but each one out of correspondence with his time. The study suggests, so I think, that the art and literature of our advanced civilization are founded on dead but necessary types of thought. A few years after the publication of the volume of *Portraits*, Pater renewed this line of study in the story of *Emerald Uthwart*, a member of an old English family, and a youth endowed with an abnormal capacity for submission. This with him was a religion, and the interest of the story is in watching how it works out in a country where the opposite is the prevalent principle. Uthwart exhibited day by day a charm of manner and a simplicity of character that won him the love and admiration of all who came near him. A soldier by profession, he was

guilty of a solitary act of disobedience, but that one act was his ruin. A sense of revulsion in the mind of the reader is aroused at the disproportion between guilt and punishment, though he is reminded that in actual life such is frequently the case, but that revolt is quelled by the patient submission of the sufferer. It is a curious study, this grafting upon the English character of the submissiveness of Eastern habits of thought. This Asiatic plant certainly does not flourish in our elementary school. *The Child in the House* is, as I have already said, an idealised picture of Pater's own childhood, with its strange wistful attachment to the very furniture of the homestead. The family worship, with its leaning to ritual, the morbid sense of pain on all sides of the sensitive child, the dawning consciousness of loneliness, the separateness, even from those relations that he loves the most, the weird apprehension as the child approaches youth, like the fears of the traveller who is approaching an unknown, but reputedly dangerous country, all these elements of childish thought are worked out with wondrous skill, making, so far as I know, the only real portrait in literature of a child's mind, real because it is that of Pater himself, and interesting because it unlocks the hidden and remote recesses of the mind of the man Pater himself. In dealing with the purely literary and critical writings of Pater, it may be convenient to take first his *Essay on Style*, inasmuch as it sets forth his own working principles in both the construction and method by which he interprets the writings of others.

Style is the manner in which a writer sets forth his ideas, and just as in ordinary life the manner commends, or otherwise, so it is with the writer. For one reader, it would be safe to say, who goes to Hooker for a knowledge of the principles of ecclesiastical polity, a score or more

seek him for his majestic English. It is the melodious charm of Addison's writings, rather than his thin moralising that keeps him alive in the affections of readers. It is the one quality that keeps alive not only the great books of the past, but also those of the immediate present.

Let us ascertain what, in the opinion of Pater, were the principles of style. He begins by sweeping away the conventional distinction between prose and poetry; the only distinction that he allows is that the latter is the subject of metrical construction. Prose has the same right to the possession of imaginative qualities as has poetry. There is only one real distinction in literature, and that is the one between the literature that is imaginative and that which merely attempts the giving of information. What Pater considers to be imaginative literature is where the personality of the writer appears in his work. "Just in proportion," he says, "as the writer's aim comes to be transcribing, not of mere fact, but of his sense of it, he becomes an artist." This, it will be remembered, is what he said of Botticelli and Da Vinci, the artist, either in colours or in words, giving forth of himself in his work. He goes on to say that prose is "an instrument of many stops, meditative, observant, descriptive, eloquent, analytic, plaintive, fervid." In Pater's opinion no writer can possess style unless he is a scholar; he must have that knowledge and training in language which will enable him to select and co-ordinate his words so that they assort together with all the harmony of true affinity. The writer, like the designer of a great building, must see the end from the very start of his work, that is, there must be real unity in his work. But above all, he keeps repeating, the soul of the man must be in his work, otherwise it will never influence other men. Truth and personality are the governing qualities of style. This is

a very inadequate digest of the great essay, but it must suffice.

Pater's *Essay on Wordsworth* was one of his earlier essays, but is published in the volume which contains the *Essay on Style*, and it will be convenient to take together his miscellaneous essays. The study of Wordsworth was essentially a congenial subject to Pater. The meditativeness and tranquillity of the life and genius of the great poet were akin to Pater's own life. He could understand, as few could, the spiritual atmosphere in which Wordsworth habitually lived. He followed the poet sympathetically in his reading into nature, of his own spiritual conception of the inner meaning of natural phenomena. And he reminds his reader that Wordsworth's poetry is the best antidote that we have to the materialism of the age.

The *Essay on Charles Lamb* is a highly appreciative estimate of the life and genius of the great essayist. Pater enjoys the rollicking humour, the breadth of Lamb's criticism, and the infinite beauty of his writings. With a gentle and loving hand he runs through the little oddities, not forgetting the dark cloud that marred the life of the great humourist. Pater says:—

In his writing, as in his life, that quiet is not the complacency of one from the first drowsy from choice, and needing the prick of some strong passion or worldly ambition to stimulate him into all the energy of which he is capable; but rather the reaction of nature, after an escape from fate, dark and insane as in old Greek tragedy, following upon which the sense of mere relief becomes a kind of passion, and with one who, having narrowly escaped earthquake, finds a thing for grateful tears in just sitting quiet at home, under the wall, till the end of his days.

The *Essay on Sir Thomas Browne* is a delicate and subtle interpretation of a writer whose quaint style has given a charm to the emotional side of ecclesiastical cere-

mony. This answers, as we have already seen, to one of the chief characteristics of Pater from his youth upwards. In this old writer's speculation on death there was also a morbid vein of thought much akin to Pater's outlook on this solemn subject.

The volume of *Appreciations* ends with an *Essay on Rossetti*, an old friend of Pater. The essay breathes the warmest admiration for the irregular genius that has given us both poetry and pictures, that have brought into our life and literature and art the spirit of the Italian Renaissance.

Pater, in the same volume, has given us a study of several of Shakespeare's plays. I do not feel competent to express any opinion on the value of these studies, but Shakespearean scholars are agreed that though Pater has much to say that is subtle and worthy of attention, the want of the dramatic instinct puts him out of court as a critic of the great poet.

Pater wrote a sympathetic review of *Robert Elsmere*.

Robert was a type of a large class of minds which cannot be sure that the sacred story is true. It is right to recognise our doubts and understand them. But other minds doubt their doubts; these set up difficulties, for they associate themselves with believers, and make impossible the position of sincere unbelievers.

It may be worth while to quote in this connection from Mr. Benson's book a conversation between Pater and Lady Dilke:—

Pater came and sat with me till dinner-time. We had been talking before that on the exclusive cultivation of the memory in modern teaching as tending to destroy the power of thought by sacrificing the attitude of meditation to that of perpetual apprehension. When the others left we went on talking of the same matter, but on different lines. Thence we came to how it might be possible, under present conditions of belief, to bring people up not as beasts, but as men, by the endeavour to train feeling and impart

sentiments as well as information. He looks for an accession of strength to the Roman church, and thinks that if it would abandon its folly in political and social intrigue, and take up the attitude of a purely spiritual power, it would be, if not the best thing that could happen, at any rate, better than the selfish vulgarity of the finite aims and ends which stand in the place of an ideal in most lives now. He has changed a great deal, as I should think, for the better, and is a stronger man.

This shows that Pater's attitude in religion was fairly neutral.

The remainder of Pater's essays, mainly studies of Greek architecture and mythology, I will pass over, but the volume on Plato merits a reference, however brief that reference may be. We are told at the outset that the duty of the student in reading *Plato* is to watch for its dramatic incidents, and to note the working of a powerful intellect translating itself amid a complex group of conditions which can never in the nature of things recur again. The personality of Plato in this wonderful book is brought out and set before the reader with wonderful skill. It is not that he was an original thinker, but that he idealised the thought of his time, and presented it in an attractive form, but withal presenting Greek philosophy as a practical religion, even for the present age. The style of this delightful course of lectures is one of much charm, and gives a vivid picture of the intellectual life of Athens during its great period.

I have aimed at giving in this paper, a paper fragmentary and far short of what an essay on such a subject ought to be, a portrait of a student, who was in a large measure a recluse and a dreamer, unfolding, as it were, his doubts and ideals in a series of books that make up a philosophy of life. But Pater's books are more than a mere *Journal Intime*; they do interpret for us, and bring nearer types of character never before thoroughly under-

stood. And all that he has written has been said in a prose of wondrous beauty, though it is difficult to say wherein the beauty lies. Pater's style is a conscious, and therefore laboured style. We need not the assurance of his biographer that each sentence was written and rewritten several times over. That Flaubert habit is evident in the careful—the, at times, too careful—selection of words fitting each other with perfect affinity, and with a sensuousness that almost passes into the region of poetry. And this uniform excellence, this elaborate carefulness, extends through the whole of Pater's books, for he has not committed a single careless paragraph to print.

For himself, for the suggestiveness of his matter, and for what he has done for English prose, Walter Pater is worthy of our highest esteem and affection.



THE LAOCOÖN GROUP.

AN HOUR WITH VIRGIL.

By A. E. HAWKES, M.D.

DURING last session Mr. Theodore Brown read a paper on "Fieri," displaying therein his usual acumen. That paper seemed to me to have for one of its results the differentiation of our members into two groups, viz.:—Those who knew something of Italy; and those who, judging by their silence, did not. Two of us present at that meeting resolved at any rate to see a little of that wonderful country, and proceeded thither with others last May. Of that journey, this paper, which one can however hardly hope to make worthy of its incipience, is the outcome.

P. Virgilius Maro was born 15th October, B.C. 70, near Mantua, in Cisalpine Gaul. His actual birthplace was Andes (Pietola), a village which consists now of a few houses only. The lantern slide shows one of the houses, and in the next, a column in honour of the poet, erected a few years ago just opposite is seen. The view is sufficiently descriptive, although only taken from a print. The following inscriptions are placed around the base of the column:—

First, I will bring back to thee, Mantua, Idumæan palms.

Pietola erected this [statue] September 21st, 1884, and now thy honour guards its site. That gentle shade from whom the place is named Pietola, rather than a hamlet of Mantua.

A little further on the traveller is shown a few antiquities, not necessarily connected with Virgil, and, still further on, in large letters, on a farm-like building the legend *Virgiliana* attracts attention, and raises hopes.

But an old mansion, furnished with large wine vats, and almost denuded as to its walls of old paintings, the vestiges of which remain, is all that can be seen, so the relic hunter is thrown back upon letters which this Society at any rate will hardly regret.

Dante does more for us than the Inn-keeper at Andes, for in answer to his query:—

“Have pity, whatsoe’r thou be,” I cried—

“Or living man, or melancholy ghost.”

“Not man,” he answered, “though I once was man ;

My parents were of Lombardy, and they

In Mantua both their mortal journey ran.

Late in great Julius’ reign I had my birth,

And lived at Rome ’neath good Augustus’ sway

When false and lying Gods prevailed on earth.

A bard I was ; and sang that just one’s fame—

Anchises’ son—who left the Trojan shores

When fell proud Ilion wrapt in hostile flame.”

“But why returned thou to such annoy ?

Why dost thou climb yon pleasant mount no more

The origin and cause of every joy ?”

With looks abashed I answered bending low ;

“Art thou that Virgil then—that fountain clear,

Whence streams of eloquence so richly flow ?

O thou of bards the honour and the light,

Let my long study of thy volume dear,

And mighty love gain favour in thy sight.”*

At the time of Virgil’s birth, Britain was just emerging into history, Casavallon appearing some twenty years after the event. Sallust’s years are 86—34 B.C. Lucretius was a contemporary. Ptolemy IX flourished in Egypt. Mithridates had recently suffered defeat, and in turn avenged the occurrence. Pompey was consul. Armenia had a quarter of a century before branched off from Parthian

* *Inferno*, canto i, line 65 (Wright).

stock. Augustus was born seven, and Horace five years afterwards.

Mantua! Now are we in the very ways of verse.

Juliet—Give me, give me! oh tell me not of fear,*

Friar—Hold; get you gone; be strong and prosperous

In this resolve. I'll send a friar with speed

To Mantua with my letters to thy lord.

.

Friar—But he which bore my letters, Friar John,

Was stayed by accident, and yesternight

Returned my letter back.†

This happily is not our theme, and well that it is not.

For never was a story of more woe,

Than this of Juliet and her Romeo.

But we must not be depressed at the outset by associations that may arise in our minds. At the time of our visit the sun was already glowing, the very hedges were made up of acacia trees in bloom, and a rich variety of Italy's flora, amongst which many familiar plants were seen, added a charm to the country road. There may be more gloriously tinted goldfinches elsewhere, but I have not seen them; and the thought that we were passing through the very fields which Virgil was instrumental in saving for his yeoman father was, to say the least, exhilarating.

I do not forget that these lands were acquired by marriage. Virgil assumed the toga virilis at the age of 15, not 17, as was more usual. He left Cremona for Milan, whence he went to Naples, or possibly Rome. Wherever it was he enjoyed the friendship of the Emperor, joining that distinguished circle which Mæcenas gathered round him at the Esquiline. It was Virgil who introduced

* *Romeo and Juliet*, act iv, sc. 1.

† *Romeo and Juliet*, act v, sc. 3.

Horace to Mæcenas, and he, Plotius, and Varus* are spoken of as among the fairest souls and dearest friends on earth.

Another instance may be mentioned. After devoting an ode to Mæcenas, and then to Augustus Cæsar, he inscribes one to Virgil; and on the occasion of his leaving on a tour in Greece, he prays that the ship may safely return, "*et serves animæ dimidium meæ*" and preserve the half of my life. Horace is supposed to refer to Virgil in *Sat.* I, iii, 31.

He is liable to be laughed at because his hair is cut in too clownish a manner, his toga drags on the ground, and his loose shoes hardly keep on his feet.

Lovers of Horace are invited to differentiate, much as a botanist would, between the togas—shall we say?—of these two men of genius. Virgil is said by Dr. Henry Owgan to have been tall and sallow, awkward and timid. He was melancholy and fond of solitude. From the distant past a copy-book heading comes to my mind certifying that Zimmerman loved solitude and quiet also. Virgil disliked compliment and was annoyed by popularity. The highest praise, in my humble judgment, is the statement, made by Dr. Owgan, that he was honoured by his brethren of the stylus. The same authority, in his preface to Virgil's *Æneid*, referring to his want of originality, states that his great power lay, not in bold and unsuggested conceptions, but in the refined taste and accurate judgment with which he could impart a grace and polish of his own to ideas less perfectly expressed by others. The celebrated actress, Cytheris, recited the song of Silenus on the stage, and thus added greatly to the poet's status. Virgil was largely read in his own day, and

* I. V., 41, Sat.

his works, like those of Horace, were standard text-books in the schools (Sidgwick).

Attention is drawn by this and other writers to the fact that Virgil was regarded as a wizard, and the reason assigned is the not unlikely one that his description of the Sibyl and the underworld in the sixth *Æneid* leads to this conclusion. His works were opened at random as oracles. Alexander Severus thus fell upon the lines in *Æneid*, vi, 852, and following.

Do thou, O Roman, remember to rule with imperial power the nation; arts will be for thee; and to impose the manner of peace; to spare those subdued and to subdue the proud.

This Severus reigned from 222 to 235 A.D.

Charles I hit upon the lines while at the Bodleian, in *Æneid*, iv, 615-620, ending:—

Nor when he shall have yielded to the terms of unequal peace, let him enjoy his power or the life he loves, but fall before his time, unsepulchred amidst the sands.

The effect upon one, whose apprehensive mind the following verse from an old ballad relating to Naseby fight depicts, may be easily imagined:—

Charles the King, is sad, foreboding
Naught but ill, as well he may,
For at Daintry yester midnight
He was warned to shun the day.
But his fate compels him madly,
And he needs must bide the fray.

Virgil died at Brundisium, Sept. 22, 19 B.C., at the early age of 51. He accompanied Augustus home from Athens just prior to that event, but his health was broken and the end was near. I can neither affirm nor question that he was buried at Naples; it matters little; but as we picture the resting place of Wordsworth, rendered more still by the ripple of his beloved stream, the Rothay, so we

can think of Virgil's ashes, alike uninfluenced by the rumbling volcano or the gentle wash of the tideless sea. His own words are said to have been inscribed on the urn containing his ashes.

Mantua brought me forth,
Calabria snatched me away,
Naples now encloses me :
I have sung shepherdings,
husbandry and warriors.

Such ashes may rest beside one's native shore, or be carried by the efferent of a midland stream, but the names associated with relics of this character are immortal.

We must now pursue our way, regretting that we cannot linger over the writings of Theocritus, Virgil's great model in writing the *Bucolics*—songs about herdsmen. Dryden says, in his preface to his tales from Chaucer, that "if Homer had not led the way, it was not in Virgil to have begun heroic poetry." Terence, Lucretius, Horace, each followed a prior writer, and Virgil, in his *Eclogues*, professedly imitated Theocritus, in his *Georgics*, Hesiod, and in his *Æneid*, Homer. But Virgil does not stand alone in this respect. We have had occasion to refer to Shakespeare's *Romeo and Juliet*. It is said in this connection that "Shakespeare plagiarized from Brock as the sculptor plagiarizes from the marble quarries of Carara."*

May we not be thankful that the *Giulietta* of Luigi da Porto was available, and that Shakespeare was quarryman and sculptor too to our enrichment. Few of the great ones can say with John Clare:—

I found the poems in the fields,
And only wrote them down.

These remarks must suffice in view of the task before

* The Masterpiece Library.

us, but I had intended to say more on the subject of plagiarism.

Full many a flower is born to blush unseen,
And waste its sweetness on the desert air,

save for some keen-eyed collector acting—dare we say?—as middleman.

We now come to the *Bucolics* which, of course, relate to pastoral scenes. The lands above referred to were about to be handed over to veterans as a reward for victories won, but through the influence of the triumvir Octavian, this did not take place.

We can almost forgive the threatened despoliation, since it has given us the lines in the first *Eclogue*, to reach which, however, we have to leap over the phrase so well known to us in Liverpool. *O Meliboeus deus nobis haec otia fecit*, and also the pious resolve that for these favours due sacrifice should be forthcoming. This may recall to some the motto of a former Mayor of Liverpool, whose strenuous life led him to adopt the words—"no thorn, no rose." Some expert may be able to tell us how much prior to this the phrase, "to compare great things with small," occurs.

Line 75 compares the lot of those who go, banished from their ancestral homes, with that of those who stay. Africa, Scythia, Crete and Britannia, *penitus toto divisa orbe*, completely divided from the whole world, are to be the destinations of the exiles.

The poet makes Tityrus ask if he shall ever return to his paternal territories to see the roof of his poor cottage piled up with turf. He asks:—

Shall an impious soldier have these so well cultivated fallows (line 23), and a barbarian these cornfields? Lo! for whom have we sown our fields?

Go, my she-goats, formerly a happy flock; go, my she-goats, I,

hereafter laid at length in a green cave, shall not behold you hang at a distance from a woody rock.

I shall sing no songs; my she-goats you shall not crop whilst I tend you the flowery cytisus and bitter osiers.

[This cytisus is the well-known shrubby or Lucerne clover.]

Yet here you will be able to rest with me this night on green branches . . . already the topmost chimneys of the country houses smoke at a distance, and longer shadows fall from the lofty mountains.

We think of Tennyson's *In Memoriam* :—

I turn to go, my feet are set,
I leave the pleasant fields and farms;
They mix in one another's arms
In one pure image of regret.

And of poor Clare, on leaving his old home :—

Thou dear beloved spot! may it be thine
To add a comfort to my life's decline,
When this vain world and I have nearly done,
And time's drain'd glass has little left to run.

One is reminded of Milton's gravid line—

And must I leave thee, Paradise?

The second Eclogue need not detain us long. It is full of delightful rural touches. Pan's art and his directions for making his instrument, by joining many reeds together with wax, is referred to. Lines 66, 67.

Aspice, aratra jugo referunt suspensa juvenci et sol crescentes decedens duplicat umbras.

Behold the steers are bringing back
The ploughs hung on the yoke.
And the sun departing doubles the increasing shadows.

On reading these lines we seem to hear—The curfew toll the knell of parting day, while lowing herds wind slowly o'er the lea. [Dr. Samuel Johnson notwithstanding.]

We must not linger over the third Eclogue, which is devoted to the description of some of those pastoral scenes associated with singing-matches and other exercises obtaining at village feasts. These songs about herdsmen are largely copied from Theocritus, a Greek poet, born at Cos during the first half of the third century, B.C. He spent most of his life in Sicily.

The fourth Eclogue begins with "Sicilian muses let us sing a little higher subject." *Si canimus silvas, silvæ sint consule dignæ.*

Caius Asinius Pollio was Governor of Cisalpine Gaul up to B.C. 41. He was a generous patron to Virgil and Horace. He was the first to raise a public library at Rome. We shall, I think, come to the conclusion that his son was the *puer* of line 18, beginning—

At tibi prima puer.

But for thee, O boy, the earth shall pour forth her first gifts with no cultivation, spreading ivy everywhere with the baccar—[a plant with a sweet-smelling root, probably the *Valeriana Celtica*—and sweet bean, mixed with the smelling *Acanthus*.

The she-goats shall bring back abundance of milk, nor shall the herds fear great lions.

Thy very cradle shall pour forth pleasing flowers for thee; the serpent, too, shall perish, and the treacherous and poisonous herb shall perish.

The Assyrian ananum [an exotic] shall grow in the open.

Line 27. The plain shall wax yellow by degrees with the ripe ear of corn, and the red grape shall hang on uncultivated thorns, and hard oaks shall exude dewy honey. But we read that even in this golden age men will surround their towns with walls, ships will still be called for, as well as pilots to direct them, and *erunt etiam altera bella*, and great Achilles shall be sent again to Troy.

These lines cannot fail to recall Isaiah xi, 8, and other verses.

The wolf shall dwell with the lamb, and the leopard shall lie down with the kid, and the calf and the young lion and the fatling together, and a little child shall lead them.

Line 40 :—

The ground shall not feel harrows, nor the vineyard the pruning hook, and the strong ploughman shall at once take off the yokes from his bullocks.

This recital will necessitate your attention to Pope's *Imitation of Virgil's Pollio*. Those searching it out for the first time will find it under the title of the Messiah, in Cary's *Pope*. Pope there says :—

In reading several passages of the prophet Isaiah, which foretell the coming of Christ, and the felicities attending it, I could not but observe a remarkable parity between many of the thoughts and those in the *Pollio of Virgil*.

I may here, following Page, say that in consequence of this prophecy Virgil was looked upon almost with reverence, and it is quite likely that Dante felt all the more safe in consequence of the views of Virgil, under his guidance, in the *Inferno*. These views lose their significance now scholars seem to have determined that the boy referred to was Asinius Gallus, the child of Pollio, born during his father's consulship.

Nothing was too optimistic to be predicted under such auspicious circumstances—and we are reminded that poetry is not the only excuse for some license, but that friendship, and even a playful humour, stand for something. In the fifth Eclogue I have marked a passage after the lament concerning the death of Daphnis. It may be remarked that two shepherds, Menalcas and Mopsus, meet in a cave, and sing of Daphnis, cut off by a cruel death. It was he who yoked Arminian tigers to a chariot, and taught the shepherds the rites of Bacchus. His death was lamented even by the Punic lions; while it is said that

five of his faithful dogs refused food and succumbed at his decease. The shrub *Daphne Mezereum* was, doubtless, named after him. Coming to line 36 commencing *Grandia saepe quibus*, we read:—

Oft times in the furrows to which we have committed barley, the unhappy darnel and wild oats bear sway. In place of the soft violet, in place of the purple daffodil, the thistle grows, and the *Paliurus rhannus*—or Christ's thorn—rises with sharp spines.

In the sixth Eclogue reference is made to the leading of Gallus by one of the Muses in the Aonian mountains when Linus, the shepherd, said to him in Divine verse:—

The Muses give to you to take them, these reeds they gave before to the old Ascræan (Hesiod), with which he was accustomed to bring the stout ash trees from the mountains by singing. Aonia was an ancient name for Bœtia.

This Cornelius Gallus settled at Rome about 46 B.C. He was one of the commissioners, Pollio and Varus being the others, appointed to divide the lands near Cremona and Mantua among the soldiers: he helped Virgil to recover his farm.

We cannot spend much time over Silenus, an attendant of Bacchus. We need not suppose that his somewhat deep sleep was Bacchanalian in character, but when he awoke and found that the playful shepherds had painted his face with mulberry juice, he may have “resolved and re-resolved,” if there were any such necessity. (I hope no one will suggest that he dyed the same).

From the seventh Eclogue the following extract shows upon what excellent terms the shepherds were with each other:—

The ash is most beautiful in woods, the pine in gardens, the poplar in rivers, and the fir in the lofty mountains, but if you revisit me more frequently beautiful Lycidas—[it is Thyrsis speaking]—the ash will yield to you in the woods, and the pine in the gardens.

I can answer for myself if asked my opinion as to the beauty of the Italian poplar.

Eclogue eight relates to us, among other things, the power of song. Verses can even bring down the moon from heaven : by verses Circe changed the companions of Ulysses. The cold snake is rent in the meadows by singing. The frequent refrain, *Ducite domum*, etc. : Lead home from the city my verses, "lead Daphnis," is very striking.

In Eclogue nine the poet is clearly afraid that the Mantuan property will be taken from them. The words : "Mantua, alas, too near to wretched Cremona," indicate that already lands in the latter place have been seized, and that the Mantuan fields might be required to make up the deficit. Help is looked for from Varus. At line 36 the reader must not be misled by the apparent modesty of Lycidas.

In neither do I seem yet to speak of things worthy of Varus nor Cinna, but to croak as a goose among the singing swans.

This is said to be a satirical reference to Anser, a friend of Antony the triumver. For a reference to this Cinna, see Shakespeare's *Julius Cæsar*. A little later, Lycidas' appeal to Mœris to lay down the young goats he was carrying into the town, that he might sing better, and his ultimately taking the burden on himself shows, if anything can, the free, friendly manner of these dwellers in Arcadia. Mœris was a servant of Menalcas. Menalcas, in whom Sidgwick recognises the poet, was credited with having saved the Mantuan lands by the power of song.

How much Pollio, a partisan of Antony, through his introducing Virgil to Octavian at Rome, and how much Varus did to enable Virgil to retain his little estate cannot well be said, but successful though he was, it is related

that he had to swim across the Mincius to escape the wrath of the would-be occupant of his small territory, which I have said already was brought into the family by marriage.

We cannot linger over the tenth Eclogue, as time presses, and more arduous toils than these await us. Cornelius Gallus was a friend of Virgil, a poet and a soldier, enamoured of Cytheris, whom Voluminus had liberated. Alas! Gallus was told that his Lycoris—an alternative name for Cytheris—had followed another through the snows, and through the rough camp. Line fifty is interesting, and gives classic warrant for a baneful habit, if trees are to be considered.

It is my fixed resolve to prefer to suffer in the woods, among the dens of wild beasts, and carve my loves on the tender trees—they will grow, ye will grow—my loves.

We have seen in these eclogues a dutiful son fighting for his father's fields; Arcadian shepherds tending their flocks, and taking part in choral competitions; and love-sick swains, whose habits and vicissitudes change but little as time speeds on and dynasties decay. Happy for us that we can enjoy rustic delights under a benign and kindly corporation, although we may not carve our hopes and fears on the bark of the tempting beech.

We now come to the Georgics which of course relate to husbandry. They are redolent of the earth, but it is the earth of the furrow, of the scattered corn, and of the hopefulness of spring, the promise of summer, and the realisation of the bounteous autumn. It is the earth which speaks with no uncertain voice of seed-time and harvest—not of that earth from which, unbidden, Yorick's skull turns up. At the request of Augustus, Virgil wrote the four books of the Georgics which were dedicated to

him, and which occupied seven years in their composition, 37—30 B.C. It may be added that their object was not only to instruct but to amuse. The other day I heard of an emigrant who took with him a copy of these writings for the former, rather than the latter purpose. That they were useful to the small farmers of Virgil's day no one can doubt. As to the use the poet made of Aratus and Nicander we cannot stay to enquire.

We must proceed to devote some few lines to Hesiod. It is related of Epicurus that, when at the age of 12 his preceptor repeated to him Hesiod's line, "In the beginning of things the chaos was created," Epicurus earnestly asked who created it. He was put off with the reply that only philosophers knew. His rejoinder was:—"Then philosophers henceforth shall instruct me."

Much has been written as to the exact period of Hesiod's life. Herodotus makes Homer and Hesiod contemporaries. A subject of much interest attracts attention at this juncture, viz., the ascertaining by astronomical calculation Hesiod's era. In *Works and Days* the following passage occurs:—

When sixty days have circled since the sun
Turn'd from his wintry tropic, then the star
Arcturus, leaving ocean's sacred flood,
First whole-apparent makes his evening rise.

Dr. Priestly* was of opinion that the method was fairly accurate. Hesiod makes the acronycal rising of Arcturus sixty days after the winter solstice. A star is said to rise and set acronycally when it rises as the sun sets and sets as the sun rises. Heliacal rising and setting occur at the same time, or nearly the same time, as the sun. Reference will be made to the Hyades and Pleiades when Virgil mentions them.

* *Lectures on History.*

With Hesiod's theogony we have nothing to do here. We need but extract one couplet from his *Days*. Referring to the good fortune or otherwise attending certain days, he remarks:—

The fourth and twenty-fourth no grief shall prey
Within thy heart for holy either day.

I extract a word or two from Mr. C. A. Elton's "*Hesiod.*" *Works*, line 47.

Measure thy neighbour's loan, and strict repay;
Give more, if more thou canst, some future day
His ready hand thy needy call supplies.

Hesiod's writings commence thus:—

When Atlas-born the Pleiad stars arise
Before the sun above the dawning skies,
'Tis time to reap; and when at sunrise now
They sink beneath the west, 'tis time to plough.

As to the oxen used for ploughing:—

Two males procure; two strong unbroken steers;
Be nine the just proportions of their years.

The ploughman should be forty according to our author. The boys of long ago are thus characterised:—

A stripling throws
Heedless the seed, and in one furrow strows
The lavish handful twice, while wistful stray
His longing thoughts to comrades far away.

Longer time cannot be devoted to Hesiod's works, but more delightful reading than Elton's translation I do not know. For instance, to linger another moment, who can read lines 97–100 without profit?

Improve the season; to the plough apply
Both thou and thine, and toil in wet and dry.
Haste to the field with break of glimmering morn
That so thy grounds may wave with thickening corn.

Towards the end of his *Works* he, following Pytha-

gorus, gives certain hints as to appeasing the river and the gods. Lines 474-477 are interesting.

Ne'er let thy hand with wine-filled flagon rest
Upon the goblet's edge, th' unwary guest
May from thy fault his own disaster drink,
For evil omens lurk around the brink.

How far this anticipates modern methods and precautions I must leave my audience to determine. Further reference would be as fruitful perhaps of discussion as if I were to attempt to account for the injunction against eating bread with unwashed hands.

We proceed to rapidly glance at the *Georgics*. *Georgic* i, line 43:—

In the new spring when the cold moisture melts down from the grey mountain, and the pliable clod thaws itself by the zephyrs, already then let the bullock begin to groan for me at the sunken plough, and the plough-share to shine, grinding in the furrow.

You will forgive the pedantic reminder that water on freezing expands, and so breaks asunder less friable materials than clods.

After this Virgil gives careful directions as to the choice of soil for corn, grapes, and grasses. He seems to have advocated both deep and more superficial ploughing, according to the soil and crop expected. He rests his fruitful fields in alternate years, and is alive to the advantages of the land lying fallow. The golden corn is to follow pulse, or the slender vetch. The harrow, and what we in the Midlands term the brush-harrow, were not unknown to him, and the *vimineas crates* were osier hurdles.

He bids the farmer pray for moist summers and mild winters. At line 121 we read:—

Pater ipse colendi.

Our Father Himself has willed that the way of tilling the ground should not be easy, and first turned up the fields by art, sharpening

men's hearts by cares, nor did He allow His realm to remain torpid in lethargic idleness.

Thereafter follows the suggestion that Jove visited the earth with all kinds of hindrances to agriculture. Line 133: *Ut varias usus meditando extunderet artes paulatim*, that by degrees experience might beat out, so to speak, various arts by meditation, and seek for the blade of corn in the furrows. He then refers to other pursuits: the snare of the hunter, the bird-lime of the fowler, and the *umida lina pelago*—the wet drag-nets drawn through the sea. Line 145 is not unfamiliar: *Labor omnia vicit improbus*. Labour conquers all things, and need urgent in all circumstances. He further inculcates the use of ploughing and pruning, if one does not wish to view with envy another man's store, and console his hunger with the fruit of the forest. Alas that he did not tell us how to find work for the willing, and how to shield our shocks and sheaves from the pitiless rain.

As we, like a recent Lord Chamberlain, are not farm labourers, neither Hesiod nor Virgil's method of working a plough need detain us. I show a slide of the plough of the period, and also a modern one. I do not forget the first time I turned a plough, a task the modern structure renders unnecessary. We must not miss the fact that the weevil then, as now, was a source of trouble, and that the ant—*atque inopi metuens formica senectæ*—fearing for an old age of poverty, was much in evidence.

Line 200, and those following, afford an eloquent reference to a man pulling hard against the stream. Line 218 will not be lost upon the amateur astronomer, nor upon anyone else when I show the slide. *Taurus, et adverso cedens Canis occidit astro*. "The dog sets, giving place to the backward constellation." Line 275 pictures the slow ass of the peasant, laden with garden produce,

which on his return is exchanged for the prosaic millstone, or even a lump of pitch.

Line 294, *Interea-conjux*, is interesting:—

In the meantime, the labourer's wife, consoling his long labours with song, runs over the web with rattling shuttle, or boils down the liquor of sweet mead over the fire.

We cannot further notice the annual sacrifice to great Ceres, nor the thunderbolts of paternal Jove, we shall get plenty of them when we come to the *Iliad*; nor need we note, this year at any rate, the signs of rain; the frogs croaking their old complaints in the mud for instance. The damsels of that day did not fail to attribute the sputtering oil and the fungating wick to Jupiter Pluvius, as they eyed themselves in front of the looking-glasses at their disposal, before seeking needed rest for weary limbs, and, dare I add, their facial muscles. The coming rain does not betoken a halcyon day, for the lovely hues are not displayed to advantage on such occasions. The guttural rook revisits with increased joy the sweet home of his gaping offspring as the weather clears.

We must leave Etna and its fires, and the trembling Alps, and hurry on; nor can we linger over dismal portents. The time is foreshadowed when the husbandman with his curved plough shall find the javelin eaten away with corroding rust, and the empty helmet, and when the heavy harrow shall unearth great bones from their disturbed graves.

I read from Whellan's *Northamptonshire* a similar passage relating to the Naseby fight. The fall of Julius Cæsar is presaged, and a prayer for the great Augustus brings the first of the *Georgics* to a close. But the words: *squalent abductus arva colonis et curvæ rigidum falces complantur in eusem*, the fields are uncultivated, their husbandmen having been carried away, and their curved

sickles forged into the rigid sword, are introduced as a striking contrast to the well-known words of Isaiah and Micah.*

The second Georgic is devoted to the praise of Italy and the delights of peace and plenty. Only brief references can be attempted. We are invited to tread the wine-press with father Lenæus, which somehow sounds better than Bacchus. Over the rich flora we must not spend time. If a man should wonder what colour cerise is, let him think of the luscious cherry. We read of germinating seeds and predatory birds, of hazels, and sterile plane trees through grafting, bearing vigorous apple-branches. Into the different methods of grafting we cannot enter. The best time for inserting the graft into the stock was said by Leonard Meager, in 1732, to be from the end of February to early April, about the change of the moon. These directions are almost exactly the same as those given by Virgil. With this in his mind at a somewhat later time, in May, the traveller rushing through the country in a corridor train, wonders what men are doing among the trees. They are not transplanting with facile skill the more desirable twig into the stock, but are lopping mulberry branches for the ravenous silkworms. I may be permitted to suggest, if I may not herein quote Joel, that the mulberry metamorphosis gives rise in old and young to visions and dreams.

A delightful touch occurs at line 82. Referring to apple trees, the poet draws attention to the luxuriant branches extending heavenward, and pictures the wonder of the tree on seeing new leaves and apples not its own. The eloquent reference to India and Ethopia may be referred to, but neither the woods of the Medes nor the waters of the Ganges are allowed to supplant the beauties

* *Isaiah* ii, 4. *Micah* iv. 3.

of Italy. Later, the poet laments the loss of the plain of unhappy Mantua—a well-known resort doubtless in his day—the sense of the loss of which was akin to that Clare felt when the village green was despoiled. Liverpool knows something of this, for has not John Lackland's lodge ceased to give a name to that part of the lane leading to it; and Northampton's postern gate is replaced by an adjective—"Castle" Station.

Line 221 must not be missed, for there we see a reference to the custom, which the vigilant traveller will have noticed, of entwining the spreading vine with the more rigid elm. Over seed-sowing and early frost, pruning knives and other needful implements, we must not linger; nor even the sacrifice to Bacchus, not yet obsolete, by the way, nor confined to the genus caper.

Line 474. Virgil's appeal to the Muses to teach of the heavenly bodies and of terrestrial phenomena is tempting, but can only be mentioned. In concluding the sketch of Georgic ii, we may say that Virgil might have written the line:—

The rolling year is full of Thee.

We may well end the second Georgic, not with war and rumours of war as the first ended, but with the beautiful picture of peace.—

Sweet children hang around their parents' lips. The chaste home guards its own modesty, the udder yields abundant milk, and the well-nourished kids contend among themselves with opposing horns in the rich grass.

We can only rapidly review the third Georgic. Line 52 and following lines set forth the points of an ox—the long neck, the hanging dew-laps and the long side, the not too small feet, the shaggy ears and crunkled horn. The horse, too, with trembling limbs and fire flowing from his nostrils, is described as he hollows the earth with his

solid hoof. We cannot join in the Eriethonian races, for time flies faster than a four-horse chariot. The breaking-in of bullocks to the yoke, and the filling of the snow-white pails with milk must not detain us. To pat the neck of the incipient war-horse, and to humour his tender mouth with bit and bridle, may tempt our fancy, but nothing more, for line 284 reminds us that *tempus fugit*, so much so that we have had to miss the passages relating to the power of love, and the line 263: *Nec moritura super crudeli funere virgo*, a passing reminder that Leander swam the Hellespont, and the final outcome of the oft-repeated feat. We can only mention the plaintive song of the grasshopper; the oaken water pipes—reminding us of old Liverpool—and the shady valleys, and the foddering of cattle, the halcyon, and the goldfinch in his thicket.

From line 349 to 380, winter is described. Later, the care of young goats and hunting the hare come under notice, and the Calabrian snake with its scaly back.

Line 445 deals with sheep washing—*dulcibus fluviiis*—in sweet streams, and this pastoral reference will doubtless awaken many a happy memory. Some of us are more familiar than others with the many unguents also set forth for the well-being of the much-afflicted sheep. The cattle plague was not unknown in the ancient world, and some of us cannot forget its incidence on the modern. We read of rabies in dogs, the swollen jaws of the afflicted swine, and the horse unmindful of the tempting grass as he smites the earth with restless feet. The dependent ears, the parched skin and the cold extremities tell their own tale, like the babbling of green fields of another writer and of another kind of patient. We have pictured for us the bullock falling under the hard plough, blood and foam issuing from his mouth, while the distressed ploughman unyokes the fellow ox and leaves the plough stuck fast. With

commendable pathos the poet asks :—"What does his toil benefit him, what to have turned up the heavy soil with the plough-share?" The burying of the dead cattle, and the lament of the waste, prepares us in some sort for the funeral pyre and the slaughter of the *Æneid*.

None too soon we arrive at the last of the *Georgics*, and plunge at once into the subject of bee keeping. We read that the bees must be sheltered from the wind if they are to carry home their food; that wandering goats, sheep, and heifers must not trample down the growing herbs; and that lizards and the fabled *procne* are undesirable neighbours. *Procne* was a poetical name for the swallow, apt to bear away to her young both bee and honey. The delightful suggestion of stepping-stones in the water, whether still or flowing, occurs, lest the wind should drive the insect to a watery grave. The wild thyme and the violet are to be cherished for the bees. The method of attracting bees by the use of scents is referred to: our recent guest, Lord Avebury, used *eau-de-Cologne*. A tinkling cymbal also attracts. As to their conflicts we need say nothing. Pleasanter reading is that relating to further cultivation to attract the bee, and of their habit of laying up a store for the winter. How they obtain a sticky glue from certain barks for the foundation of their honeycombs, Virgil describes at some length. It may be remarked that he relied on Aristotle for his natural history, hence his frequent reference to the so-called king bee. As is now well known the queen bee differs much from the rest. She is the only perfectly developed female in the hive. She may lay 2,000 or 3,000 eggs per day, and she is more correctly styled the mother bee. Next come the drones to which we need not further allude. The worker is a strong undeveloped female, its eggs producing drones. The worker nurses the larvæ, builds

combs, collects honey, carries water, ventilates the hive by fanning with its wings, performs the duty of undertaker and sanitary expert, and finally acts as the guard of the establishment.*

We cannot devote more time to this subject, but you will allow me to quote these lines from Thompson referring to the sulphur method of obtaining the honey.

Sudden the dark oppressive steam ascends ;
And, used to milder scents, the tender race,
By thousands, tumble from their honeyed domes,
Convolved, and agonizing in the dust.
And was it then for this you roamed the Spring,
Intent from flower to flower ? for this you toiled,
Ceaseless, the burning Summer heats away ?
For this in Autumn searched the blooming waste,
Nor lost one sunny gleam ; for this sad fate ? '

Lines 281-286 refer to the Arcadian method of replenishing the stock. It had been noticed that the corrupted blood of a dead ox brought forth bees, and we are reminded of Judges xiv, 8, when Samson saw a swarm of bees and honey in the carcase of the lion. I forget how long ago it is since Matthew Arnold lectured to us in Liverpool on lucidity, and Dr. Bastian said all there was to say on the subject of spontaneous generation.

We close our study of the Georgics, if we may so style this brief review, by a short reference to the story of Orpheus and Eurydice. The pursuit of Eurydice, the wife of Orpheus, on the part of Aristæus, a son of Apollo, led to that unfortunate lady's death through the bite of a serpent which lay in the grass. All the bees of Aristæus were destroyed. He was ordered to offer four bulls and four heifers as a sacrifice, and from their carcasses swarms of bees sprang. Hence the method of replenishing one's hives above referred to. But to return to Eurydice, whom

* *The Book of Bee Keeping*, by W. A. Webster.

we see fleeing headlong towards the fatal water-snake. We learn the manner of her death, and the penalty exacted from the cause of all her woe. Here Virgil gives us an early glimpse of the Eumenides with snakes entwined in their locks, of Cerberus and his gaping mouth, and Ixion's wheel. Through all these horrors Orpheus sought his lost wife. We read of him soothing his wounded love, singing by himself to assuage his grief on the loss of his sweet wife—"dulcis conjux." His melodious strain stopped Ixion's wheel. The hopeless task of Sisyphus was for a time suspended, and the thirst of Tantalus was temporarily in abeyance. Pluto and Proserpine shared the sorrow of the bereaved, and promised that Eurydice should be restored to him if he consented not to look back until he was well out of their domains. But now—line 485—having escaped all dangers, he and Eurydice were emerging into the light of heaven when—"subita dementia"—a sudden madness seized him. "A madness," says Virgil, "indeed to be forgiven if the shades can forgive." Forgetful, he looked back, as well he might, and all was lost beyond recall. Not this time the wife of Lot fleeing from a city undergoing final destruction; not this time—but I anticipate—the wife of Æneas possibly bent on reclaiming some missing trinket—but the sweet singer, Orpheus, forgetting what most he needed to remember, bereft thus suddenly for the second time.

His lost labours weighed him down as he realised to the full the merciless decree. A crash, thrice repeated, was heard over the pools of Avernus. The descent was easy, the egress marked by a sense of incomparable loss. I wish I could so pronounce the Latin beginning "*Quis furor*" that all could follow its meaning. I fall back upon my own—I had nearly said my only—medium.

What great madness has for ever ruined both wretched me and thee, Orpheus?

Lo! cruel fates call me back again, and sleep closes my swimming eyes.

And now, farewell. I am carried off enveloped in thick night, and holding out to thee my impotent hands no longer thine.

She vanished from his sight, and saw him not, as he grasped at the shadows, desirous as he was of saying many things. He remained for many months beside the deserted Strymon, soothing, if not himself, wild beasts, and influencing the trees of the forest with his song. The poet compares his sorrow with that of the nightingale deprived of its young by the hard ploughman, who has torn them unfledged from their nest. He pictures the inconsolable bird seated upon a bough renewing his pitiable song, and filling the surrounding places with sad complaints. We cannot follow the wanderings of the faithful Orpheus. Dare we add a poetical fancy to a poetical expression, and listen as under the shadow of the Thracian Hæmus a chill, hopeless voice cries "Eurydice, Eurydice," only to be answered by the empty echo, "Eurydice, Eurydice."

THE "ÆNEID."

It is quite impossible for me to enter fully into the motives of Virgil in writing the *Æneid*. I prefer to think that he was determined to produce a great work, and that with Homer as his model he proceeded to accomplish his purpose. No one who intends to study the Epic must think of doing so without having Page's *Virgil*, Owgan's critical preface to his translation, and Sidgwick's notes at his side. Nor will he care to do without Church's *Stories from Virgil*, nor Gaston Boissier's *Archæological Studies of Virgil and Horace*, in French. He need have no mis-

givings about reading Pope's Homer's *Iliad* if he should only be partially familiar with the Greek language.

The reproduction from Mr. Birrell's *Obiter Dicta* of Mr. Edward Yates's story will be forgiven. Homer's work lay on his table, Shirley Brooks entered the room, and, seeing the book, said, "Ah! I see you have Homer's *Iliad*! Well, I believe it is the best." Mr. Birrell adds, "And so it is. Homer's *Iliad* is the best, and Pope's Homer's *Iliad* is the second best." Mr. Birrell further tells us that Pope, whose wisdom herein, he leaves no room to doubt, relied on Chapman's translation and Ogilby's 1660 version. I cannot quote Prof. Conington's appreciation of Pope's *Iliad* as Mr. Birrell does, but the latter agrees with Mr. D. E. Rosetti's law, "Thou shalt not turn a good poem into a bad one." "Pope," he says, "kept this law."

The siege of Troy had already been going on ten years when Homer's *Iliad* begins. Agamemnon had seized Chryseis and Achilles Briseis. Agamemnon is compelled to send back his captive, the King and Achilles quarrel, Nestor intervenes, but Briseis is seized in revenge. Achilles withdraws his forces and, through Thetis, Jupiter gives victory to the Trojans.

We cannot enumerate all the forces of the Greeks even with Homer's help. We next come to the duel between Menelaus, the husband of Helen, who chose him, so to speak, under the guidance of Ulysses and Paris. Helen was the beautiful daughter of Tyndarus, King of Sparta. Priam, King of Troy, father of Hector and of Paris, who arranged the combat, watches the combat from the walls. So does Helen, accompanied by Iris, the messenger of the gods. Paris is overcome, but Venus envelops him in a cloud and arranges a meeting between him and Helen. Agamemnon demands her restoration. The war is con-

tinued ; Menelaus is wounded, but is relieved by Machaon, a son of Æsculapius. Agamemnon distinguished himself, and so did Nestor, who earned for himself undying fame.

Diomed, with the aid of Minerva, does great things, and it would have gone hardly with Æneas had not Venus, his mother, helped him ; she herself is wounded, but Apollo rescues her, and Æneas is healed in the temple of Pergamus. He returns to the fight, and Diomed sends Mars, whom he wounds, groaning to heaven. Next, Glaucus representing Priam, and Diomed the Grecian hero, meet and exchange arms for auld lang syne. Hector takes a tender leave of his wife Andromache, and returns with Paris to the field. Next, Minerva being fearful for the Greeks, the fight is postponed, but Hector and Paris fight till night-fall. Paris refuses to restore Helen, but offers them her riches. Jupiter agrees to Minerva helping the Greeks. Teucer, whence Teucria and Teuceri, is wounded by Hector.

Agamemnon counsels the return of the Greeks. Diomed and Nestor oppose, and the latter advises that Ulysses and Ajax be sent to Achilles, sulking in his tent. Achilles refuses to be reconciled. Menelaus, Nestor, Ulysses and Diomed, with others, hold a council of war.

Diomed and Ulysses go as scouts. They kill the unfortunate Dolon, a spy, after getting all they can out of him, and then, slaying Rhesus, seize his horses and return in triumph.

Ulysses addresses the trembling Dolon thus :—

Who'er thou art, be bold, nor fear to die,
What moves thee, say, when sleep has closed the sight,
To roam the silent fields in dead of night?
Can'st thou the secrets of our camp to find?
By Hector prompted, or thy daring mind?
Or art some wretch by hope of plunder led
Through heaps of carnage to despoil the dead?

This sounds very like Satan rebuking sin. Agamemnon next is successful, but Hector also excels, and Ajax rallies the Greeks. Achilles watches the fight from the ships. Next, Hector forces one of the Grecian gates, and the Grecians are driven to their ships. The successful Idomeneus is opposed by Deiphobus, another son of Priam, and Æneas, and compelled to retire. Juno objects to Jupiter's partiality to the Trojans, and takes steps to thwart the god:—

She speeds to Lemnos o'er the rolling deep,
And seeks the cave of Death's half-brother, Sleep.

Neptune succours the Greeks, while the Thunderer sleeps. In turn, the Grecian wall is broken and the Trojans rush in, only to be driven back by Ajax. Patroclus, assuming the armour of Achilles, puts even Hector to flight, but he is ultimately disarmed by Apollo and slain by Hector. Menalaus, assisted by the Ajaxes, bears off the body to the ship.

The prayer of Ajax for light, line 705, Pope's Homer's *Iliad*, Bk. XVII, must be read.

In general darkness—Lord of earth and air!
O King! O father! hear my humble prayer:
Dispel this cloud, the light of heaven restore;
Give me to see, and Ajax asks no more.

Over the shield of Achilles we cannot linger, to imitations we cannot even refer.

Book XIX relates the reconciliation of Agamemnon and Achilles. In the tent of the latter, Briseis laments over the body of Patroclus.

Book XX.—Achilles nearly kills Æneas and Hector.

Book XXI.—The onslaught of Achilles, who secures twelve live captives to sacrifice to the shade of Patroclus, drives the Trojans into their city. Vulcan and Juno dry up the river Scamander, which has assisted in the rout.

Book XXII.—The Trojans have now secured themselves within their walls. Priam and Hecuba, his wife and the mother of Paris, in vain strive to induce Hector to enter the city. He is pursued by Achilles round the walls and is slain by him, and his dead body is dragged at his chariot—Priam and Hecuba looking on. Andromache hears their lamentation, and she, the mother of Astyanax, of whom more hereafter, the captive who formed the centre of Leighton's great work, which in its turn captivated Manchester, and left our shores for the banks of the sluggish Irwell, swoons at the sickening sight.

Her thoughts are for her boy,
Whom Ilion calls
Astyanax, from her well-guarded walls,
Is now that name no more, unhappy boy,
Since now no more thy father guards his Troy.

Book XXIII describes the sacrifices connected with the death of Patroclus, including that of the twelve captives, and also the funeral games which follow.

Book XXIV.—Priam secures the body of Hector through the clemency of Achilles—who keeps the body one night in his own tent.

To recapitulate: Achilles fell before Troy, Paris having shot him in the heel; Ajax killed himself. Helen, after Paris's death, married Deiphobus, but afterwards returned to her first husband, Menelaus. Agamemnon was murdered; Nestor returned to Pylos to his family. Ulysses is dealt with in the *Odyssey* as everyone knows.

How far Æneas may be credited with the foundation of what we know as Rome it is not our present purpose to determine. How much Juno resented the judgment of Paris, and how she was influenced by other motives to take sides against the Trojans, the pious hero knew full

well. He was hardly prepared for all he had to suffer in consequence of these considerations coupled with Juno's partiality for Carthage.

Of the meeting of Æneas and his mother, Venus, we can say little. She recounts to him the story of Dido, of the murder of her husband, Sichæus, by the remorseless Pygmalion, of Carthage, and then, in turn, extracts from Æneas an account of his flight with his penates, and of the shipwreck he had suffered. As Venus departs he recognises his divine mother, under whose guidance he speedily reaches the rising wall of Carthage. Here he sees representations of the Trojan battles, fatal alike to Priam and Achilles. Cloud-enveloped still he sees other Trojan heroes and soon Dido herself, to whom Ilioneus addresses himself in eloquent terms, praying that if not permitted to reach the Latian shore, they may at least find refuge in the Sicilian Straits. Dido, in reply, goes so far as to ask them to share her realms if no better choice awaits them. The cloud is dispersed, and Æneas and his companion, Achates, revealed. Æneas thanks the Queen, who in turn displays her knowledge of his parentage and his home beside the Phrygian Simois. Æneas is conducted to the palace, and lavish gifts are sent to his followers; Achates is sent to the ships to bring Ascanius and fabulous presents.

Ascanius, the son of Æneas and Creusa, was named subsequently Ilus and also Iulus.

Ilus was the name originally of the son of Tros, King of Troy.

Iulus connects him with the Iulia gens at Rome (Sidgwick).

Venus has but little confidence in Dido and her intentions, and sends not Ascanius, who is gently put to sleep in Cythera, whence Cytherea, another name for Venus, but

Cupid. More need hardly be said, unconscious of her coming misery, she makes much of the visitor. Bacchus plays his part, so does the love-sick Jopas, on his golden harp. (A second violin would have been more appropriate). Line 749, Infelix Dido! forgetful of Sichæus snatched from you by the murderous hand of Pygmalion, and you, too, Prince Æneas, unmindful at any rate now of Creusa, we meet again in the still distant realms beyond the Styx, whose ferryman is Charon.

We rapidly pass over the incidents of the love and death of Dido, how she was captivated by the story of Æneas, how she gloried in the promise of strength from the union of the forces of Troy and Carthage. Rumour was busy, and told of ease, and how work was neglected after the marriage of Æneas and Dido.

The swift-footed Mercury is sent by Jupiter to remind Æneas of his duty, and that Italy and Rome, not Carthage, await him. To his stealthy departure but little further reference need be made. I direct those who have not read it to the Rev. A. J. Church's chapter on this subject. Dido says:—

Surely no Goddess was thy mother, nor art thou come of the race of Dardanus. As for thee, I keep thee not, go, seek thy Italy across the seas. Only if there is any vengeance in heaven, thou wilt pay the penalty for this wrong, then wilt thou call on Dido in vain.

The manner of Dido's death is soon told, how she fell upon the sword of Æneas as she lay upon the funeral pile she herself had planned, and how Proserpine did not shred the lock from her head, as Dido herself had made the fatal thrust. Iris in pity came and shred the lock, saying: "I give thee to death, even as I am bidden, and loose thee from thy body."—(CHURCH).

The fate of Troy hung in the balance, for Apollo, Mars, and Jupiter were on the Trojan side. Minerva induced Epeius to construct a huge wooden horse within which were hidden Menelaus, Ulysses, Thoas, Machaon the

physician, Pyrrhus the son of the dead Achilles, and Epeius himself. The rest of the Greeks went away. Of the treachery of Sinon, and of his speech, much need not be said. Mention must be made of the priest, Laocoön, who did not trust the Greeks. His famous words, line 49, *quid-quid id est timeo Danaos et dona ferentes*. Whatsoever that is, I fear the Greeks even offering gifts, are well-known to all. This brave son of old Priam hurled his javelin against the wooden structure, and elicited a groan from its deep recesses. A little later we find the priest sacrificing a large bull to Neptune, when two serpents from Tenedos advanced upon the surface of the sea, and with breasts erect, and sanguineous crests, made their way with sinuous folds towards Laocoön and his sons. They seize and devour the wretched boys' limbs, and bind in huge folds the priest himself, while he attempts the rescue of his sons. Twice they wind themselves around their victim, extorting cries from him as he attempts to disengage himself from their deadly coils. They at length betake themselves with gliding course to the citadel of the Tritonian goddess (Minerva), hiding themselves beneath her shield.

So convinced were they that Laocoön had done the Greeks a great wrong, that the Trojans themselves drew the horse within the walls of Troy. I regret that we cannot dwell upon the sequel. We read that the concealed Greeks *invadunt urbem somno vinoque sepultam*—assail the city buried in sleep and wine. They are assisted by their fellows with the ships under Agamemnon.

Time does not suffice for more than a passing reference to Cassandra, the unfortunate prophetess, and to Hecuba, the wife of Priam, who distrusted arms, and fled to the altar for safety, only to see her husband, who had for the last time donned his coat of mail, slain by the son of Achilles.

Æneas, planning his escape, rates Helen for all that has befallen Troy, but Venus reminds him of other duties, to which he betakes himself. He carries his father, Anchises, on his shoulders, and accompanied by his wife, Creusa, and his son Ascanius, hastens from the doomed city. But Creusa is separated from them, and her image afterwards appears to Æneas. With touching words she commends to his paternal care the young Ascanius, foretells a great future for Æneas, and, like the baseless fabric of a vision, eludes his grasp, and vanishes from his sight. But we must tarry a moment or two at the Vatican.

We have but little time to refer to the funeral games of Anchises, and the races of the ships, won by Cloanthus with the *Scylla*; the foot races, and the unfair win of Euryalus; the reward to the plucky vanquished, wherein the gracious act of Queen Alexandra in a recent contest was anticipated. There were fair folk before Alexandra, but perhaps not so fair. The horse racing and the shooting with bows and arrows cannot be described; but it may be mentioned that one archer cut the string detaining the captive dove with his arrow, while the next archer's shaft brought the fluttering victim to the earth.

But we are at the Vatican, and show a slide of the two boxers, Kreugas (defence) and Damocerus (attack), without further reference to the ancient art. Between them stands Perseus, the rescuer of Andromeda, holding Medusa's head, by means of which Atlas was turned into a mountain.

I wonder if one can judge a statue by the company it keeps? Here we have Hermes—the masterpiece of the Vatican—the Apollo Belvidere, the Torso of Hercules; not far away the dying Gaul, and finally, as far as concerns us, the Laocoön, the work of Agesander, Polydorus, and Athenodorus, natives of Rhodes. Pliny thought it superior

to all else in painting and statuary. My belief is that the work was done from Virgil's description of the fearful scene. I ask your attention to the slide, and refer you to Lessing's *Laokoön* (Bohn's Library) for details which time alone forbids.

Æneas came to the land of Italy, near Cumæ, famous as the dwelling-place of the Sibyl whose prophecies were written on leaves. The mysteries of Eleusis and the search of Isis are interesting enough to devote a whole evening to. Æneas is admitted, and enters the land of shadows. Some care has to be exercised in these regions, for Hercules, on being admitted, chained the watch-dog, and Theseus sought to carry off Proserpine. The worst vision for Æneas was Dido, whose "heart was hard against him," and who betook herself to the grove where Sichæus dwelt. Felix Dido. Of the mysteries of the golden bough of Anchises, whom his pious son strove to embrace, "but it was as if he clasped the air" (Church), and of the father's reference to glories yet to be, we cannot further speak. We can but refer to the sixth book, and the lines 860-887, which Virgil recited in the presence of Octavia. Marcellus had died, and Octavia, his mother, on hearing the recital, fainted.

But I weary you. Alas! No more of Dante of whom I had thought to write so much. Of Virgil's pessimism as regarded his own salvation we cannot speak further. We must not enter into the controversy as to eating meat after sacrifice, nor can we dilate upon the touching comparison by Andromache of Astyanax and Ascanius. I trust I have not merited the Tarpeian punishment, from which seat (see Virgil, *Æneid* viii, line 347—*Hinc ad Tarpeiam sedem*) victims were hurled in sight of the forum of old.

I bring my paper to a close, having only laved my

ankles in the shallows of the placid sea. To those of you who have already breasted the wave, and gained the soft delights of the further shore, I make my obeisance. To those about to do so, I offer my felicitations. Alas! that I cannot proffer my halting companionship. Suffer me to conclude with Tennyson's appreciation of Virgil, that more eloquent words than mine may linger in your ears.

Roman Virgil, thou that singest
 Ilion's lofty temples robed in fire,
 Ilion falling, Rome arising,
 wars, and filial faith, and Dido's pyre ;

Landscape-lover, lord of language
 more than he that sang the Works and Days,
 All the chosen coin of fancy
 flashing out from many a golden phrase ;

Thou that singest wheat and woodland,
 tilth and vineyard, hive and horse and herd ;
 All the charm of all the Muses
 often flowering in a lonely word ;

Poet of the happy Tityrus
 piping underneath his beechen bowers ;
 Poet of the poet-satyr
 whom the laughing shepherd bound with flowers ;

Chanter of the Pollio, glorying
 in the blissful years again to be,
 Summers of the snakeless meadow,
 unlaborious earth and oarless sea ;

Thou that seest Universal
 Nature moved by Universal Mind ;
 Thou Majestic in thy sadness
 at the doubtful doom of human kind ;

Light among the vanish'd ages ;
 star that gildest yet this phantom shore ;
 Golden branch amid the shadows,
 kings and realms that pass to rise no more ;

Now thy Forum roars no longer,
 fallen every purple Caesar's dome—
Tho' thine ocean-roll of rhythm
 sound for ever of Imperial Rome—

Now the Rome of slaves hath perish'd,
 and the Rome of freemen holds her place,
I, from out the Northern Island
 sunder'd once from all the human race,

I salute thee, Mantovano,
 I that loved thee since my day began,
Wielder of the stateliest measure
 ever moulded by the lips of man.

EDWARD FITZGERALD:
A BRIEF REVIEW OF HIS LIFE AND
CHARACTER.

By W. J. B. ASHLEY.

I do not think Mr. President, ladies, and gentlemen, any great effort will be needed on your part to recall to memory that the centenary of Edward FitzGerald was celebrated last March. It is astonishing to what fame and renown one short poem will bring a man; and if we but glance over the history of our literature, even in the most cursory manner, instances are, if not numerous, at least frequent, where the pedestal of immortality has rested, not on the broad solid foundation of so many volumes octavo, but on the narrow, almost imperceptible basis of a few well-chosen rhythmic lines of verse.

When one opens the *Rubáiyát*, and reads in whatsoever disjointed manner the sentiment of the moment may prompt, be it the first or the hundredth and first quatrain, I am prone to surmise the hero-worshipper is apt to wonder who FitzGerald was, where he was born, bred, and buried, and how he came to adapt this *Rubáiyát* of Omar Khayyám. "We have a right," a *littérateur* once wrote, referring to FitzGerald, "to glean all we can about this great man." Was he a great man? Was he not rather an *ungrate* man? His genius was not transcendent. The few works he has given to posterity, with the exception of the *Rubáiyát*, are not what is termed *read* in these days, and could we forget Omar Khayyám we should in all probability cease to remember Edward FitzGerald; but

the two men are indissoluble, like Castor and Pollux of old, when we think of one, involuntarily the other claims kinship, but which of the two is the more interesting figure in literature does not at this present concern us. Both were poetasters in their respective countries, but of such singular charm and dignity that the hours one may spend in reading or studying their philosophy will not, I prophesy, prove entirely futile.

FitzGerald first saw the light in a quaint Jacobean mansion which is situated about a mile and a half to the north of Woodbridge. His mother was the daughter of John FitzGerald, sixteenth in lineal descent from Maurice, fourth Earl of Kildare, and his father was the son of John Purcell, M.D., of Dublin, who claimed; (the why we know not;) descent from the Lord Protector. For reasons not unconnected with his wife's succession to valuable estates, Purcell adopted his wife's maiden name of FitzGerald, and under this patronymic we shall henceforth know the family. FitzGerald's mother was a woman of surpassing beauty, that piquant Irish beauty which is so full of grace, charm, and attractiveness. Her features were frank and ingenuous, her eyes fearless and bright, and the mass of hair that surmounted her noble forehead was as ebon as the wing of a raven. She was imperious, dignified, stately, with not the slightest trace of *mauvaise honte*. To quote the son:—

My mother was a remarkable woman, and as I constantly believe in outward beauty as an index of a beautiful soul within, I used sometimes to wonder what feature in her fine face betrayed what was not so good in her character. I think, as usual, the lips; there was a twist of mischief about them now and then like that in the tail of a cat, otherwise so smooth and amiable.

FitzGerald's father was a big-built, ruddy-faced, kindly man, whose special capacity was the gentle art of doing

nothing. At one period of his life he was a member of Parliament, but in contrast with his brilliant wife was designated as merely Mr. FitzGerald, and nothing more. He played no part in his son's drama of life, for the child derived his force of character not from the paternal but maternal side of the alliance. The mother was a linguist, so was the son; admired the poet Crabbe, so did the boy; and although the call of the blood was so strong in both, they differed *en passant* as the years rolled by in these respects. She had a violent temper, lived sumptuously, dressed magnificently, drove a carriage and four, had a box at the opera, entertained in a most lavish manner, in brief, fulfilled to the uttermost the duties of a lady of rank and affluence. He was the gentlest of men; lived all his life as frugally as an Irish peasant, never even kept a gig; when he went to the opera, which was not often, he sat in the prosaic pit. He gave informal dinners to his friends occasionally, and although they were hospitable repasts they were not comfortable. While his guests were partaking of what was provided, he would pace the room munching an apple, or maybe a turnip, conversing in this peripatetic attitude about books and bookmen. Being a voracious reader, he was an omniscient conversationalist regarding literature. These traits were *not* inherited from his mother or his father; they were not inherited, in fact;—they were natural, his unconventionality was as grotesque as it was delightful. What should we say of a man who walked with his boots slung over his shoulders? It was no uncommon sight to have seen him thus along the Woodbridge lanes. Or of a man who went yachting with a silk hat on his head, a lady's fur boa around his neck, and a copy of Sophocles in his pocket? Not *compos mentis*, most assuredly! and yet from his earliest to his latest and last days he was one of the best beloved beings

in these islands. FitzGerald's exterior beauty was loveliness, his interior beauty soulfulness, and the twist of mischief was not in his lips but in his eyes ; they twinkled with humour, and for man, beast, or bird a gentle word was ever ready, and a kind action welling in his breast.

During FitzGerald's period of adolescence, a great friend of the family was a certain Major Moor, a learned Anglo-Indian. A man of refined and many accomplishments who, during the period of Edward's childhood, had settled at Great Bealings, about a third of a league distant from the FitzGerald homestead. Age and youth, in despite of Shakespeare's dictum, were good friends. Together they roamed the surrounding country, and nature, that fond mother, gave to the child a sweet musical voice that vented expressions of joy and amazement at the bird on the wing, the rabbit scampering off to its burrow, and the pheasant creeping into the undergrowth. To the Major a rejuvenation, not in what the child-mind held to be wondrous, but the innocent innocence of his young companion. These roamings were not *merely* roamings to Edward, although he did not, nay, could not, know then. A far deeper meaning lay hidden beneath the sunny surface. The Major told him of a glittering, fascinating, odorous East, and revealed its beauties and mysteries to him as parents are apt to do the fairy stories of Hans Andersen or the *Arabian Nights*. He also discoursed on philology, and thus sowed the seeds of that chaste style the boy was to reap the fruits of in later life. No wonder, then, that for this Major, FitzGerald should ever have cherished a profound respect. When the reaper came, heedless of clover or grass, and parted these friends, FitzGerald, sad and sorrowful, said a *better* man had not been left behind. There is a deep touch of pathos in that word better ; FitzGerald knew the loss of a friend full well, and

the marked difference between a friend and a good friend. He felt after the Major had passed away something to him had been lost that, search the world over, he could never find or replace. A part of *me* is gone, he may have muttered; perhaps he did.

Aldeburgh was a delightful fishing village a hundred years ago, and being within easy reach of Woodbridge the FitzGerald family often repaired thither. Edward's playmate and companion during the visits was a niece of Major Moor's, a pretty, fun-loving little girl, Mary Lynn by name. The children played on the sands, waded, and amused themselves in the thousand-and-one ways that children and only children can. The smell of the sea was aromatic to FitzGerald then. The rolling billows had an indescribable charm for him. And there was no sea like the Aldeburgh sea ever to his eyes. Sixty years later these once happy children met again, and in the sere of life recalled to memory those spring days of long ago. He also loved to mingle with the fishermen, who, in those days, were uncorrupted by Monsieur Traveller, a totally different class of men from their progeny, whose untutored mannerisms are now wholly different from their forefathers. "Monsieur Traveller has money" is their watchword now; not so then. The simple fishermen of Aldeburgh, in their simple vernacular, told Edward simple stories of the sea, of the terrors of the deep, of those lands they may never have seen, beyond that point where the bright red sun dips and dips until the ocean is turned into crimson and gold. Between the dusk and the twilight, when the day's play was over, he learned to repeat certain passages from "The Village" and "The Parish Register," for Crabbe, it will be remembered, was Aldeburgh's poet; and afterwards, clad in a little white surplice, with his blue eyes closed and tiny hands rever-

ently together, he knelt at the beautiful mother's knee and repeated after her the Lord's Prayer.

The days with the Major, Mary Lynn, and the Aldeburgh fishermen soon passed, and in all probability too quickly. In 1821 he commenced his early serious education at King Edward the Sixth's School at Bury St. Edmunds, and six years later went into residence at Trinity. His friends were Thackeray, who, as fancy bade, called him Ned, Neddibus, Neddikins, and Yedward; Francis Duncan, who became Rector of West Chelborough, and of whom FitzGerald wrote twenty years later:—"He is now a quiet saturnine parson with five children, taking a pipe to soothe him when they bother him with their noise or misbehaviour; and 'I,' as the Bishop of London said, 'By the grace of God I am—what I am.'" W. H. Thompson, the embryo Master of Trinity; F. B. Edgeworth, brother of the great Maria; Charles Buller, pupil of Carlyle; J. M. Kemble, the Anglo-Saxon scholar; James Spedding, of Bacon fame; and his contemporaries were Charles, Frederic, and Alfred Tennyson. He was not a brilliant scholar; he never attempted to scale those dizzy heights of academic pre-eminence; he studied the classics in an easy, nonchalant manner; never spoke at the Union, preferring to listen, he said, to Thackeray or Spedding making fools of themselves. He devoted so much of his time to music, painting, and wandering the precinctic country, that he forgot there were apertures in his hose, and whether he was suitably provided with boots. On one occasion, when his mother called on him in her coach and four, he could not leave his room to see her; his only pair of shoes were at the cobblers. Notwithstanding all these shortcomings and pre-occupations, he took his degree in 1830, the thanks in the main being due to his tutor, rather than his own initiative.

After leaving Trinity he paid a visit to Paris. There he met Thackeray, and being good friends they foregathered. FitzGerald consoled himself with the idea, and idea it only was, he was studying statuary, and Thackeray, with all the pride of early manhood, art; but they were frequently seen on the Boulevards, and infrequently in the Louvre. Both could recount nights and nights of jollity, of mild dissipation, of *comme il faut* cast to the wind. France had passed through many dark days, and now the thunder clouds of Revolution had opened and revealed a serener and brighter aspect, the people had become lighter-hearted, and these young visitors knew it; but after some months of gaiety FitzGerald returned to England, cherishing hopes to dazzle the world with his literary productions. Was there ever a truer case of living in hope and dying in despair than FitzGerald's? For he was as ambitious as any of the great men of the nineteenth century. No man could have taken, or did take, greater pains than he with the few works he produced, especially that *Golden Eastern Lay*, but he had a weakness and a failing. There was a strain of indolence in him. It was extremely difficult to get him to do anything. He was, as he said of himself, emphatically a Paddy. "What is the use" was a favourite expression. He thought it was infinitely better to sit than to stand. Not that he was lazy, but rather he had no capacity to stir, to be energetic, to be brisk. It took him thirty years to make up his mind to visit Scotland, but, when there, not more than three days to return to Suffolk.

Immediately after his arrival from France, he whiled away some months calling upon his friends, and then ensconced himself in a comfortable farmhouse at Naseby, and in this hamlet those FitzGerald eccentricities first made themselves apparent and led him to remark, "We

FitzGerald's are all mad, but with this difference; I know *I am*." He created a sensation at church by wearing a magnificent blue surtout. It not only astonished the good people of Naseby, but proved a theme for much jest among his intimate acquaintances; but he did not care either for country folk or jocular friends; conventionality never troubled him; even such vainglorious things as wealth, rank, and respectability had no secluded niches in his temple of idealism. In this historical village his powers in poesy began to awaken, for during the years 1831 and 1839 he composed seven short poems, one of which, entitled "Will Thackeray," reveals the genial warmth FitzGerald felt for his friend.

The chair that Will sat in, I sit in best,
The tobacco is sweetest that Willy hath blest.

Poetry, however, did not absorb his entire attention. He continued to take an interest in art and music, and, alas! to ponder those ponderous problems of life, death and eternity. He brooded and meditated over the pitfall of humanity, of which, to use his own words, "I have seen something." He had seen nothing in reality, his tenebrific thoughts belied him. The FitzGerald of the Aldeburgh and Trinity days was rapidly passing into a far, far different FitzGerald, for at thirty he was an old man, not old in years, that could not be, but in his outlook upon life. At this age, or any subsequent period of his life, he never appeared very light-hearted or happy, although his conversation at times was most amusing. He became a vegetarian after reading George Cheyne's *Essay on Health and Long Life*, and very appropriately the handles and knobs of his dinner service were fashioned to represent apples and pears. He left Naseby, and made his abode a two-roomed thatched cottage, engaging the

services of an elderly Suffolk woman to minister to his few and simple wants. The cottage was situated outside the park gates of Boulge Hall, Woodbridge. The Hall was the property of his father, and later of his brother John. When John was in residence the brothers never visited or even desired to see one another. The longer the absence the friendlier the feeling. They were not antagonistic; there was no disregard or calumny. That one lived in a Hall and the other in a Hut had no bearing upon their personal regard one for the other. They simply did not wish to meet, an instance of the FitzGerald madness. In Boulge cottage, as it was then called, how that strain of indolence matured! His yearly round in brief was thus:—

January is come and gone. February, twenty-eight days. March, light at six p.m. Then April with a blush of green on the white-thorn hedge. May, cuckoos and nightingales. June with the wild rose and wall-flower perfume. July so full of golden sunshine. August, fruit ripening. September, days shortening and nightingales departing. Then he would sigh, for October had come. November, damp and miserable. And lastly, December; twelve months gone and nothing accomplished. His chief delights were sailing on the river Deben in his yacht the *Scandal*, in the company of his friend, Kenworthy Brown; or meandering through the woods of Hasketon with sketch book under arm—he had a wonderfully delicate touch with pencil and brush—or exercising his powers of patience with fishing rod and tackle in the neighbouring streams. He visited London occasionally, and what bothered him most was all the clever people going wrong with such clever reasons for so doing. He thought the dullness of the country people preferable to the impudence of the Londoners, and when in the metropolis he longed

for the kind clear air of the country. He became enamoured with the daughter of the Reverend George Crabbe, Vicar of Bredfield, son of the poet. He loved her, not in the romantic sense prevalent in those days, these days, and maybe days to come ; not, to quote La Fontaine—

When love casts over us his spell
To prudence we may say farewell!

He probably proposed marriage in the most dilettante manner imaginable, but Miss Crabbe, after much self-analysis, declined to bestow her hand upon FitzGerald ; why, they alone knew ; but when one considers that the young lady was profoundly pious, and the man a prisoner in Doubting Castle, religion may have had much to account for in preventing them being joined together in the holy bonds of matrimony. FitzGerald, being a sensitive man, felt the refusal most keenly, and whilst suffering from bitter disappointment composed a charming and realistic, though mournful, poem, entitled “Bredfield House.” It was also after Miss Crabbe had declined his offer of marriage that he began to think thus :—

I have dreadful suspicions that this fruitless way of life is not looked upon with satisfaction by the open eyes above ; one really ought to dip in a little misery. Perhaps, however, all this ease is only intended to turn sour by and by, and so to poison one by the very nature of self-indulgence. Perhaps, again, as idleness is so very great a trial of virtue, the idle man who keeps himself tolerably chaste, et cetera, may deserve the highest reward ; the more idle the more deserving. Really, I don't jest, but I don't propound these things as certain.

How characteristic these words are of the man ! for Lucifer finds mischief for listless hands ; and in view of the truth that FitzGerald never in his life was guilty of one dishonourable action, *he* did, if any man ever did, deserve the highest reward.

Boulge cottage was as simply furnished as his parents' six residences were gorgeous. His sleeping apartment contained no furniture worthy of the name. He could hang the few clothes he possessed upon his person, and badly hung they were! His study and dining-room combined was crowded with pictures, music, books innumerable, tobacco pipes in dozens, and walking sticks of all shapes, sizes, and conditions, mingled to him in a pleasing confusion. Order was not, nor ever was, one of his weaknesses. It was during the years he lived in the cottage that he penned most of those beautiful letters that now adorn our literature. Letters that not only reveal the man of culture, the man of nature, but the real sincerity that was inherent in him. What Carlyle would have called the "heroic faculty." Letters that are a veritable mine of literary likes and dislikes, of dulcifluous criticisms of men, of manners, of the general topics of the day, of his inept existence, which he advised no one to attempt to imitate. He wrote to Frederic Tennyson, who was in Italy:—

People affect to talk of this life as very beautiful and philosophical, but I don't. Men ought to have an ambition to stir, and travel, and fill their heads and senses; but so it is; I should travel like you if I had the eyes to see that you have; but, as Goethe says, "The eye can but see what it brings with it, the power of seeing." If anything I had seen in my short travels had given me any new ideas I should travel more. As it is, I see your Italian lakes and cities in picturesque annuals as well as I should in reality. Traveling, you know, is vanity; the soul remains the same.

So whilst the Tennysons, Carlyle, Thackeray, and Spedding were abroad, he sat at home under Suffolk skies echoing and re-echoing those lines of Shenstone:—

Tedious again to mark the drizzling day,
Again to trace the same sad tracts of snow;
Or, lulled by vernal airs, again survey
The selfsame hawthorn bud and cowslip blow.

He would have loved winter better than summer if he could have known, as he sat within the tropic latitude of his fireside, that there was not increased want and misery beyond it. He was ever pleased to receive a letter; they were as rays of sunlight into a sunless land. Sometimes when, and only when, the spirit moved him, he made discreet journeys in uneventful directions. He was to be found in Ireland, a country he loved very truly. That was quite natural; but he gave no adequate reasons, which was more natural. A thought did linger in his mind, that the people and the land were homogeneous, and the beautiful eyes of the natives, shaded with long black lashes, had an air of mystery about them. On other occasions he was in Cambridge or at Beccles, visiting one of his married sisters. At Geldestone Hall, where this sister resided, nothing pleased him more than to wait until the maids had retired, and then go down to the kitchen and sit over the dying embers of the fire reading the *Idylls* of Theocritus, or the *Commentaries* of Cæsar; but at heart, just as when in London, he longed for the kind clear air of Woodbridge.

He loved children, and believed they kept one's interest in life. To him, the child question of to-day was the problem of to-morrow, which could only be solved by affection for the young that is always building up and putting some line of beauty on every life it touches. By making their life seeming and being something other than a mere ephemeral existence. By its words being benedictions, and its very breath full of inspirations. A child was not a mere articulate, mischievous piece of mechanism, to be sat on a narrow form, and in fear of corporal chastisement compelled to absorb into that fitful brain a demarked course of general knowledge, but a microcosm that breathed the breath of life, that had

understanding, and, of a truth, was a macrocosm with a future full of lights and shades and one knew not what.

The tide, in FitzGerald's affairs of man, was taken at the flood in his fortieth year. It led him not on to fortune but immortality. Hitherto his days had been spent in riparian idleness, and not an altogether *dolce far niente* existence. He was beginning again to bitterly bemoan his fate, when he became acquainted with E. B. Cowell, a young man of twenty, who subsequently became Professor of Sanskrit at Cambridge, and who unlocked the door of the treasure house of Persian literature, and bade this eccentric FitzGerald of Woodbridge to enter. How very strange the conflux of events is; if there had firstly, been no Major Moor, secondly no E. B. Cowell, there would have been thirdly no FitzGerald that we know of to-day, fourthly no Omar Khayyám so well understood by Western minds, and fifthly Lowell would never have sung—

These pearls of thought in Persian gulfs were bred,
Each softly lucent as a rounded moon.
The poet Omar plucked them from their bed,
FitzGerald strung them on an English thread.

Before Persian became a passion with FitzGerald, he began to read Spanish. In the midst of his new-found studies he published *Euphranor: a Dialogue on Youth*, and *Polonius, a Collection of Wise Saws and Modern Instances*. As time passed on, the friendship between Cowell, his wife, and FitzGerald ripened and ripened. The Cowells resided at Bramford, in a small tenement, with a flower garden in front and a fruit garden behind. The windows were quaint, with red venetian blinds, FitzGerald's favourite colour, and over the door clambered a red flowering japonica. The place was the very essence of rusticity. Little wonder there need be that FitzGerald was frequently to be found at Bramford. Mrs. Cowell wrote

pretty poems; FitzGerald revised them. Cowell was one of the best of fellows; free as Auster from pedantry. A man even in those young days that was well versed in many branches of erudition, but pretended to none. A better friend, or one after his own liking, FitzGerald could not have discovered. Head to head they sat, sometimes in that old-world garden, sometimes in one of the low ceilinged rooms of the cottage, poring over Cervantes and Calderon, and the result of these happy days may be read in FitzGerald's rendering into English of six dramas by the latter author.

The work was published in 1853, and was attacked with such severity in the *Athenæum* that the sensitive author endeavoured to withdraw the volume from circulation; but there was Cowell to console him in his chagrin, and under Cowell's influence he deserted Spanish and began to study Persian with zeal and zest. Then he began to climb slowly but surely the Parnassus slope to his masterpiece. He dipped into the *Gulistan* of Sa'adi, the *Mantik ut Tair* of Attar, the *Masnavi* of Jalálu'd-Din, the *Odes of Hafiz*; but he cried, "beside Homer, Dante, Virgil, Æschylus, and Shakespeare don't these Orientals look silly!" They may have done to FitzGerald then; it was a case of silly first and sane after. In his subconscious mind, dim and faint, was a glittering, fascinating, odorous East, faintly perceptible through the cumulus that was spread over his vision of purview. What must have been the coruscating power of the transcript of the *Rubáiyát* of Omar Khayyám Cowell sent to him from Oxford? As he held the manuscript in his hands, and began to decipher the Persian characters, the clouds cleared; He beheld Orientalism in its pure serene light, and perceived that Omar was a man of his own limitations—a lover of beauty, of solitude, of humanity; a

doubter with a desire to comprehend what was concealed beyond that eternal dome of blue. He was encomiastic in praise of Omar, and again Cowell and FitzGerald are head to head. A translation is adumbrated, but in the midst of their researches Cowell is appointed Professor of History at Calcutta, and a parting was inevitable. FitzGerald returned to his lonely cottage and wrote:—

Your talk of going to India makes my heart hang really heavy at my side,

and, recalling the days at Bramford—

Ah, happy days, when shall we three meet again? When dip in that unreturning tide and time of circumstance? In those meadows, far from the world it seemed as Sālāmāns island, before an iron railway broke the heart of that happy valley, where gossip was the mill wheel, and visitors, the summer air that momentarily ruffled the sleepy stream that turned it, as they chased one another over to lose themselves in a whisper in the copse beyond.

It is a sombre truth that troubles never come singly, and a greater sorrow than the departure of the Cowells was hanging like the sword of Damocles over FitzGerald. On the 4th of December, 1856, he married Miss Lucy Barton. It would have been far far better for his wife and himself if he had not turned a deaf ear to the entreaties of his friends, who advised him not to marry Miss Barton. No two people in this universe were more unlike; their ways were as diverse as north and south. Lucy Barton was the epitome of conventionality; FitzGerald the acme of unconventionality. She never enjoyed a dinner unless formally dressed; he abhorred the stiff collar and cravat, much preferring a silk scarf around his throat and a shawl around his shoulders. They differed on the question of diet; the husband was a vegetarian, the wife was not. When the former took meat he liked it done thoroughly; the latter not only liked meat, but

preferred it underdone. And so these and many other matters were. All may have been overcome if Mrs. FitzGerald had been tactful, but she was not, and FitzGerald was not a man to be forced. "Give her everything you possess," said Kenworthy Brown, "but your name." Alas, the one thing he should not have given to her he did, and paid the penalty, for after six months of wedded life, amid tears and tribulations, they parted for ever. Why did he marry Miss Barton? Why did he ignore the wisdom of his councillors? It was a question of honour, and being an honourable man he could not, his conscience would not permit him, to break his pledge. He had promised her father, Bernard Barton, the Quaker poet, she should never want. Barton died practically penniless, and in fear of abusive tongues FitzGerald thought the only way out of the difficulty in which he was so unfortunately placed was through the labyrinth of matrimony. There had been no love-making, no writing of amatory epistles, no trysting place. He looked forward to his marriage as two sensible people of sensible age quietly settling down to live in peace for the remainder of their life, and although the contrary happened, FitzGerald, true to his word to Barton, made a generous allowance to his wife, so that she of all women should never want, and she never did.

After they had agreed to separate, he left Gorleston, where they had resided, and rented two rooms over a gunsmith's shop on Woodbridge Market Place. The passion for Persian, which had become dormant in the interim, began to reawaken, and he set to work on an adaptation of the *Rubāiyāt*. In due course the manuscript was completed, and sent to Fraser's for publication. It lay in the editorial sanctum for twelve months, and was then returned to the author, who decided to publish the poem at his own expense, and two hundred copies were issued in a

small quarto pamphlet form in 1859, price five shillings. Not one copy was bought. The publishers sent the whole parcel to him. He distributed a few copies among his friends, and the remainder he carried to a bookseller, Quatrich, and made him a present of them. Quatrich reduced the price to half-a-crown, then a shilling, then sixpence, and finding no buyers at this price, he placed the consignment in the penny box outside of his door. Then they began to sell, and for months nothing was heard of the thin brown paper-covered pamphlet, until a copy chanced to fall into the hands of Rossetti, who, detecting the genius of the poem, brought it to the notice of Swinburne, Sir Richard Burton, and other men of taste and talent. In these days, what sum of money would be given for a copy of that first edition is beyond conjecture.

For the semi-recluse to suffer from the sense of loneliness is perhaps akin to the convivial man who is surfeited with society. It was true that FitzGerald, in his humble little rooms over the gunsmith's shop, had nobody except his proprietor, whom he called Gooseberry, on account of the word being more euphonious or applicable than Berry, the man's name, to prick the sides of his, FitzGerald's, intent. Cowell had not returned from India then. Lord Tennyson he would have visited if he (Tennyson) had not been living in such grand style. Thackeray, if he had not been the lion of society. Carlyle, if he had not been such a great man. He felt lonely, and his heart, to use his expression, was vacant. He longed for a friend with whom he could commune, hob and nob, tell his troubles to, and seek consolation. He found such a man at Lowestoft in a stalwart, six foot salt, named Joseph Fletcher, or Posh. This sailor became FitzGerald's idol. He described him as a man of the finest Saxon type—blue eyes, nose less

than Roman, more than Greek, and strictly auburn hair that any woman might sigh to possess; he was a man of simplicity of soul, justice of thought, tenderness of nature; a gentleman of nature's grandest type. They sailed together, sat together, smoked together. An uncommon compound of friendship this! A Trinity man, well cultured, and a sailor man, uncultured; but they were friends, the best of friends. On one occasion they were driving from Lowestoft to Yarmouth, and on the way they passed through Gorleston. FitzGerald said to Fletcher, pointing to a street, "I want you to drive down here, I want to see the house where I lived with my wife." When they reached the place, he cried "Stop!" and then added, sorrowfully, "Ah Posh, had you but come to me at Lowestoft then. If I had only known you at the time I used to wander those hills unhappy." He pointed to the uplands to the west of Gorleston. "Her ways were not my ways, and we parted. Drive on, there's a good fellow." They drove on with no further desire for conversation, the one thinking of his friend, the other of his wife and nowife. That journey from Lowestoft to Yarmouth must have been a sad one, full of remorseful musings and meditations that one does not entirely hold one's life in the hollow of one's hand, that there are other powers which guide and compel one whither and whence, and not until the present has become the past can one glance backward and view, and know, and understand. Lucy Barton was the bane of FitzGerald's life; she unmanned the man. It was a truth he never forgave himself for, the one regrettable misaction he was guilty of. Daily he became more atrabiliary, sinking into a state of melancholy that eliminates the joy of living into the sadness of living. "I have never refused the advice of a friend," he said, "without after regret."

Different this from many men who accept the counsel of a friend and suffer in the same direction.

After finding so much solacement in a Suffolk sailor, it would be almost unimaginable to prognosticate these best of friends would part. They did; owing partly, Posh said, to "interferin' parties," and partly because Posh's ways were not altogether FitzGerald's ways. The partnership they had held in a fishing smack was dissolved, and FitzGerald quitted the sea. He was also compelled to leave his rooms over the gunsmith's shop on account of Gooseberry's marriage. So he retired into a small house he had had built on the bosky outskirts of Woodbridge, which he called "Little Grange." Here he spent the remainder of his days, occupying only two rooms. He whiled away the days, months, and years by contributing to the *East Anglican*, a local paper, revising the *Rubáiyát*, writing poetry, and publishing several minor works, namely, *Readings in Crabbe*, *Notes on Charles Lamb*, *A Capful of Slang*: but as time rolled on he began to smell the rose above the mould. His beautiful mother, good father, most of his brothers, sisters, and friends had predeceased him; his eyesight was failing, and his heart was troublesome. Thus was FitzGerald at seventy-four.

FitzGerald was exactly the reverse of Carlyle's description of the sentimental philanthropist, who loved men in the abstract, but was intolerant of Jack and Tom, who had wills of their own. When Mrs. Berry, Gooseberry's wife, suffered from rheumatics in a severe form, he called every day for nine months. He allowed a doctor a fixed sum per annum for visiting the poor of Woodbridge. The man who borrowed two hundred pounds from him, and repaid three small instalments at the appointed time was sufficient for FitzGerald; he put the promissory note in the fire, and requested his debtor to trouble not about the

balance. He was extremely kind and courteous to elderly people, and was vexed that the late Queen did not command Carlyle to be seated. "He is an old man," he said, "and Her Majesty should have been more thoughtful." A more unostentatious man, or one who did incalculable good by stealth, or in a quiet way, or who abominated cruelty to animals, there could not have been than FitzGerald.

He loved all English wildflowers, the violet in particular, to which he addressed these lines—

Fair violet! sweet saint!
Answer us. Whither art thou gone?
Ever thou wert so still, and faint,
And fearing to be looked upon.
We cannot say that one hath died
Who wont to live so unespied,
But crept away unto a stiller spot,
Where men may stir the grass, and find thee not.

His passion for brilliant colours was abnormal. The crimson and amber of the setting sun; the gilt of picture frames; the burnished gold of the pheasant plumage; and would have had all ladies dress in flamingo red. With regard to birds, he preferred the note of the blackbird to that of the nightingale, which he held ought to be a-bed like the rest of us; another favourite was the wren. He never fastened his envelopes, his landlady did so for him.

The "Vision of Sin" he thought more highly of than anything else written by Tennyson. "It is too mystical for most people, and has long been to me the shadow of an awful truth." He used to walk about the lanes near his house at midnight. When Woodbridge was asleep he would emerge from his chateau enveloped in a green and plaid shawl, and, like an old Roman senator in toga, brood over his dismal marriage, or ponder those everlast-

ing problems of life, death, and eternity, like Omar Khayyám had done eight hundred years before. His favourite authors were Shakespeare, Boccaccio, Calderon, Cervantes, and Madame de Sévigné. His taste for beautiful words and a chaste style was most delicate, but he averred the highest genius was not as a rule the most correct, and instanced Beranger and Burns. He loved Scott, Dickens, and Thackeray. Praised *The Pirate*, *Guy Mannering*, and *Kenilworth*; liked *David Copperfield*, with the exception of the pompous and pathetic parts; thought *Pendennis* best at the beginning, and *Vanity Fair* at the end; likened Keats and his Fanny to Catullus and his Lesbia; preferred Richardson to Fielding; and considered the letters of Mrs. Trench to be the next best in our language to those of Cowper and Walpole. The *School for Scandal* he held to be our best comedy. He was very fond of Longfellow, Lowell, and O. W. Holmes. Pronounced *Evelyn's Diary* colourless after "dear Pepys," and Gray's *Elegy* to immortality. The *Northern Farmer* moved him to tears, and the last scenes of *Henry the Fifth* made him "blubber." He never cared for the *Iliad*, with its brutal gods and heroes, but could read the *Odyssey* with delight, and was of opinion Aristophanes was greater than Æschylus or Sophocles. Plutarch's *Lives* was one of the most interesting books he ever read. He did not care very much for Pindar, preferring Herodotus. "No sonnets," he said, "sounded well after 'Daddy Wordsworth's.'" He possessed an excellent library, the excellence being not in quantity but the quality of its contents. Many of the books were bound in green half-calf with red label, the work of a local binder. On the shelves were copies of the leading English, French, Spanish, and Greek dramatists, and many of the English poets and novelists.

When he was unwell and wished to consult his medical

adviser, the consultation took place on the doorstep. He had a horror of consultation rooms. He never dealt in compliments, except under strong compulsion. Towards the end of his life he loved to visit the haunts of his youth. He thought no one should have a monument erected to his memory until a hundred years had proved what popular opinion was. He did not pretend to write poetry, but had a high notion of his judgment in it. He was glad to see any man do anything well; he thought it was his vocation to stand still and know within himself whether it *was* done well.

On the 13th of June, 1883, FitzGerald paid a visit to George Crabbe, grandson of the poet, at Merton Rectory, near Thetford. He retired that night somewhat fatigued at ten o'clock. The next morning an enquiry at his door met with no response. The sun on the cornfield, the gold on the spire were for him no more; and in these days if one wanders into Boulge churchyard, the umbrageous spot where he is sleeping his last long sleep may be seen. On the recumbent granite slab is carved a cross fleury, and the epitaph, "It is He that hath made us, not we ourselves." A rose of Persia is growing at the head of the grave, and if the mood be meditative, the lin lan lone of the distant Grundisburgh bells will reach the living ears, as it once did the ears that now hear not.

THE GENESIS AND EVOLUTION OF LAW.

By BERTRAM B. BENAS, B.A., LL.B.

THE study of law is perhaps the most human of all studies, for it deals with the relationship of man to his fellow-men. It would seem to be as true to say that man was made for the law, as that the law was made for man. Whatever we may have been, we are now a legal species of living beings, and we appear to have been so from the time "whereof the memory of man runneth not to the contrary." Whether primitive man was struck with the regularity of nature around him and above him—in the seasons, the heavens, and in the ways and habits of the lower animals—and, finding it good, applied the principle to his dealings with his human associates; or whether he discovered that regulation of action was necessary for his own safety and well-being, and his descendants saw in this regulation a human counterpart of the principle of the rest of the natural world, these questions must remain open, and the development, rather than the origin of the idea of law in humanity, is of larger interest to the student of social history.

If ever we were lawless, we have outgrown, since time immemorial, the possibility of even thinking lawlessly. We cannot rid ourselves of the law even if we would, and nearly all of us want the law, and occasionally the lawyers! A very small minority of human thinkers have conceived of a state of society where they hold that there would be no law—no limit to the volition of the inhabitants. In truth, these philosophers are the very embodiment of the essential necessity of law for humanity. They are at best, or at

worst if you will, but legal reformers. They would sweep away all laws regulating the life of society; but they would still leave one very fundamental law, one vital to their civilization. That law would be the principle "There is no law," a principle which is as much a law as the most lengthy enactment on the Statute Book—a powerful limitation of human volition; for what would be done to the minority that in all probability might some day arise and say "we shall have laws—a few simple rules to regulate the affairs of our state?" If they were discouraged or physically prevented, then volition would prove to be as much limited in this law-less society as in the most complicated modern state. If they were not discouraged or prevented, but simply tolerated, either the state would be divided into two states, nominally and actually, or else there would in fact exist two states, if not nominally so. For on the one hand you would have the "lawfuls," a compact aggregate of individuals; on the other you would have the "law-less," a group bound together by contrast to the "lawfuls," if by no other bond of union. So divided, each half might live at peace; attempts at fusion would inevitably result in nothing but a fortuitous concourse of human atoms. So that the success of a lawless society would seem to depend either on the immediate recognition of the right of the "lawfuls" to secede whenever they should think fit so to do, with a consequent numerical weakening of the state and its possible annihilation; or, on the other hand, by the suppression of the desire of the "lawfuls"—the "lawless" becoming more law-enforcing than the "lawfuls." Expulsion and suppression suggest a preceding disobedience; and disobedience suggests law, and law suggests order, and humanity has lost the art, if ever it possessed the capacity, of resting content with chaos. We are of the law and the law is of us.

We are creatures of the natural law, nor can we evade the yoke, if yoke it is. Of the spiritual law we are by birth and later by conviction; we feel we are of the spiritual law as we are of the Spirit itself. And the human laws are our own creation. We have been endowed by nature with a law, and we are unable to renounce the gift. We inherit the spiritual law, and when we come of age it is ours to confirm and accept the devise; and law is so much in our estate, so much of our own bone and flesh and tissue, that we wish to add to our inheritance, and we make more laws—we recreate. We place upon ourselves more yokes. We stoop to conquer.

But it is well to bear in mind that it is difficult in these days to refrain from ascribing to a pre-scientific age scientific habits of thought, and we are on safer ground in seeking for a principle in the early activities of our primitive ancestors, to look to necessity as a fundamental motive force, and beneath that, the elemental sense of self-preservation as a basis of all life-work, leaving for a later period the superstructure of happiness as an ideal, and still later those higher storeys in the human edifice from which a nobler and wider outlook can be gained; nor can these pinnacles be reached without the feeling of security which has been won in an earlier day by the weapons of necessity.

We need no theory of social contract to help us draw a picture of primitive society finding the necessity for law. Self-preservation, as an elemental instinct from the very earliest of days of man on earth, is an hypothesis the accuracy of which should hardly afford us serious misgivings. The earlier man was in all probability sufficiently self-preservative as to protect inroads upon his own security by the threat of retaliation, and we know that at first he preferred to have his lawyer, judge, jury, sheriff,

and, above all, police officer combined in his own personality. Whether when man first came into contact with his fellow-men the meeting was friendly and commercial (thus leading to business and, incidentally, to litigation), or whether it was hostile and criminal (thus leading to punishment), is obviously a matter of speculation; but if subsequent history affords a clue to the earlier chapters of human activities, one might safely hazard the opinion that the pair came into conflict, and that commercial relations followed as the consequence of a treaty of peace. So that those who hold that criminal law, or rather criminal punitive procedure, was first in the legal field have much convincing argument upon which to rely.

Unanimity of punitive methods among individuals may have suggested the grouping of wrongs for which they were inflicted, and the grouping of wrongs may have brought to mind, inferentially, the grouping of rights—rights which men had grown to regard as things they expected to enjoy, the infringement of which would mar that security, the hoped-for reward of hardly-won self-preservation. We shall have yielded to the temptation of making the pre-scientists pre-scientific if we convince ourselves that law and punishment became the function of society rather than the individual, as a result of the neighbourly comparison of notes on the subject of the punitive treatment of delinquents. The conception that the infringement of a right which every one forming the human settlement had become habituated to regard as belonging to all, would be more appropriately punished by some representative of that human settlement (that is the state), was in all probability a very small ingredient in the motive force which deflected punishment from the groove of retaliation. Rather the fear of the excessive wreaking of vengeance, especially if the convicted be the victim of mis-

taken identity, a lot which might befall any member of the community, suggested the desirability of the regulation of punishment by some impassive individual, whose duty it was to see wrong expiated with the hardened leniency of the functionary, and stripped of the ardour and wrathfulness of the injured. So if self-preservation from mistake, and not altruism in all its purity, was largely the motive in the ascent from retaliation to punishment, the community was none the less the gainer. For as often is in the history of law, the individuals who composed the community had to bend to rise. They secured themselves rights; they secured the wrong-doer's punishment; they had to sacrifice the lowering notions of personal vengeance. They had devised for themselves a method whereby they were taught to curb the impulses of anger, to sacrifice the immediate desire of the individual to the ultimate well-being of the state.

It would seem probable that in his commercial transactions primitive man built up a customary system of dealing, obedience to which led to further business, and unfair dealing led to discontinuance. So that the damages for breach of contract, it is submitted, amounted to exclusion from the community or exchange, a penalty in early society sufficiently severe to render honesty in mercantile life necessarily the best policy. In some of the earlier Biblical books, the only passages dealing with contracts seem to point to the fact that the essential interest appeared to be centred in the certainty that the property, which passed as a result of the contract, would not be disputed; in other words, that the conveyance or transfer of property, giving a good title to the purchaser, was of larger legal interest than the contract which led up to it, and as such was ancillary to it.

The primitive mind in law, as in religion, was not

satisfied without visible tokens of processes and ceremonies, and an appeal to the sense perceptions was necessary to impress the imaginative consciousness of early man with a due appreciation of the importance of a transaction, and so Law, young in its career, had to employ the picturesque if it wished to win a permanent place in the hearts of men. We see in the Biblical narrative the methods by which a contract was formed,* and no less fanciful was the procedure in the beginning of Roman law, where a contract was rendered good by the solemn weighing of brass on the balance. Its value was largely evidentiary, and it testified to the solemn act, and thus gave to the possessor of the fruits of the contract an indisputable title. It was left for a later age to conceive of contract as an agreement—a mental assent of two minds, not necessarily followed immediately by any transfer of property. But Law has conquered, because it has never refrained from grasping the fact that in order to succeed it must appeal to the consciousness of the people, not to be in advance of it, but to win their support by their understanding of its ethics, by their belief in it, and by their confidence. Law has been fortunate in possessing in its later history parallel codes of conduct which have fertilised it and enabled justice to keep pace with human progress.

In early days, punishment could only oust retaliation by conceding to the avenger the assurance that the criminal would receive as much severity as at the hands of the angry victim. For Law itself had to stoop to conquer. Professor Holland, in his *Jurisprudence*, has pointed out

* See, e.g., the contract and conveyance of the land in Machpelah to Abraham, Genesis xxiii, vv. 13 to 20. The contractual negotiations are described in vv. 13 to 15, and the transfer of the property evidenced by the procedure, narrated in v. 16, is completed by the assurance recorded in vv. 17 to 20.

that recent investigators hold that "the consensual kernel of contract has only gradually dispensed with the husk of ceremonial with which during long ages it was almost identified."* Ceremonial in law was particularly idiosyncratic to the Roman mind, and the ceremonialism of the Roman law was infused with an exclusiveness which was in direct contrast to the ethical temper of the Jewish legal system as laid down in the Old Testament. The Mosaic code enacted that there should be "one law to him that is home-born and to the stranger that sojourneth among you" (Exod. xii, 49, repeated substantially in Numbers ix, 14, and xv, vv. 15 and 16). The alien under the Roman law, on the other hand, was not subject to its provisions. The Roman law in effect established the principle, "Roman law for the Romans," ultimately leading to the proposition that "There shall be one law to him that is home-born, and another law to the stranger that sojourneth among you." But this very narrowness of the Roman law was the ultimate cause of its enormous expansion, not merely in the increase of its legal principles, but in its width of outlook.

The *prætor* was the supreme judicial magistrate in

* The survival of the weight attaching to ceremonialism in law in the legal consciousness can be illustrated by a recent case (*Lawford v. Bilericay Rural District Council*, 1903, 1.K.B. 772) which is of considerable interest from the standpoint of legal history. According to the general principle applying to corporations in English law, a corporation can only contract by means of a document under seal. The effect of the decision in this case is that where work is done or services rendered at the request of a corporation, in respect of matters for the doing of which it was created, and the benefit of the work and services is accepted by the corporation, a contract to pay will be implied, and the absence of a contract under seal is no answer to the action. The judgment, in the case cited, is obviously one in consonance with the merits of the facts and the reasonable conclusions of the legal public opinion of the age; but it is none the less remarkable that until so lately as 1903 a point of law was not finally decided, which entirely depended for its continued validity upon the respect for formalities, and that, notwithstanding the rationality of the contract as originally formed, it was a case which lawyers felt had yet to be argued and considered.

Rome. As one of the higher magistrates he was invested with the right of issuing edicts. It became the custom for the *prætor*, at the commencement of his year of office, to proclaim in his edict the principles of the administration of justice (apart from those of the strict Roman law—the *jus civile*), upon which he proposed to act. Successive *prætores* acquired the tradition of incorporating the principles of their predecessors with such amendments as circumstances might demand. The *prætor* had no direct legislative power—but as no judge could hear an action without his authority, he could grant an action where none lay before.

The increase of the foreign population of Rome, and the extension of commercial relations, led to the appointment, in the year 247 B.C.E., of a second *prætor*, called the *prætor peregrinus*, whose function was to administer justice between foreigners in Rome, or between foreigners and Roman citizens. This *prætor* similarly issued an annual edict, comprising the principles which he intended to apply during his period of office. These principles were composed of those elementary notions of justice which, through their general prevalence among all the nations with which Rome was brought into commercial contact, might reasonably be regarded as the essential and fundamental conceptions of law. The tendency of historians at present appears to be against the view approved by Sir Henry Maine, that this compilation of principles was from the first a conscious generalisation, but rather that the collection of laws were formed as a result of necessity, and that the development was circumstantial and accidental. Whatever its source, this legal system came to be known as the *jus gentium* (the law of nations), the law which applied to the mercantile transactions of foreigners in Rome in their dealings between themselves or with Roman

citizens. Prior to the appointment of a *prætor peregrinus*, the only legal institution which dealt with foreigners was the court of the *recuperatores*, and their jurisdiction was limited to cases where one party was an alien and the other a Roman citizen. Their difficulty lay in the choice of law which was applicable to the circumstances of the case. It was the subsequent employment of the prætorian machinery, with its capacity for indirect legislation, which enabled the Romans to establish a comprehensive system of law, adapted to the requirements of non-citizens.

The *prætor urbanus*, or the *prætor* for the home-born, became accustomed to incorporate into his annual edict selections from the principles laid down in the edicts of the *prætor peregrinus*, and by this means the Romans themselves gradually acquired the advantages of a wider, less rigid, more equitable justice, derived as it was from the *jus gentium* — the essential elements of law prevalent among other people. From Cicero, *De Officiis*, Book III, we gather that as early as the second century B.C.E., the *jus gentium* was regarded as a collection of principles found in the laws of all nations, and which therefore suggest points of contact, common ground, in the requirements and conceptions of mankind.

This *jus gentium* came to be identified with the *jus naturale*, or law of nature. The ascription of the law of nations to a higher source—the law of nature—lent to its enactments and provisions that imaginative glamour which pictorial symbolism of ceremonial gave to the strict Roman law. Now the law of nature made its appeal on those very grounds upon which all legal systems must largely rest for their success. It had its roots in that public sentiment, which is the most fruitful source of confidence.

The law of nature has been defined by Professor

Holland as "That portion of morality which supplies the more important and universal rules for the governance of the outward acts of mankind." The Stoic philosophers, whose dominant maxim was "to act according to nature," spread in Rome the view of the world as regulated in both its moral and physical aspects by natural law. Natural law consisted of those elements of regulation in natural and human activity which were universal in prevalence; and, being simple in character, and comparatively few in number, the principles, regarded as the essential rules of life, formed an ideal well calculated to attract the followers of a civilisation which had become too formal, and which had outgrown respect for those particular ceremonials without which, in the earlier days, law could hardly have won its way.

Rome had reached a stage in its legal history which seems incidental to all humanity. Rome had arrived at the point where it had acquired the taste for the spirit, and had lost its relish of the letter. In fact, the worship of the spirit, and the neglect of the letter, is but progress in ceremonialism. It is merely after all an advance from the solemnity inspired by visible forms to the veneration of the intangible—the creation of a sentimental atmosphere to correspond to the more material objects of respect.

It is in this progress that we grasp the intense humanity of law, for from its primitive manifestations to the highest flights of ethical justice it rests for a support, like all human thought and action, upon some spiritual basis, at first illustrated by some picturesque formality attended by solemn surroundings, later, evidenced by an appeal to a higher ideal of right and wrong. But man is sufficiently consistent, and sufficiently self-respectful, to decline to smash the objects of his cult in centuries gone by. He could not afford by vandalism to cut at the roots

of that solemnity and veneration in public sentiment upon which Law has in the past depended for its existence. He proceeds contemporaneously to displace his old laws and old legal institutions with the progress in the barometer of the popular consciousness and conscience. He must not destroy his much-worshipped form; nay, more, he must add to its veneration by its encasement in glass. Side by side he may display the spirit, and from the growing exercise of its powers, and the increasing regard for its qualities, he may hope that there will be realised the conception that in its day the form originally was respected alone for the principle which it contained; and there comes a time when the pure spirit must be reinfused in the old form, and remain there united until the barometer of humanity registers a further change. Such a progress was to be found in ancient Rome when the widening of outlook created a desire for ampler scope than the old Roman civil law allowed. And their desire was gratified, not by the destruction of the archaic ceremonial code, but by the introduction of a parallel system based on simpler principles, regarding the spirit, neglecting the letter, the *jus prætorium* (the "prætorian law"), or equity, with its incorporation of so large a share of the *jus gentium*, and the essential notion of the *jus naturale*. Salvius Julianus, in Hadrian's time, by the consolidation of the prætors' edicts, prepared the way for the ultimate absorption of prætorian equity into the general law of the land which ultimately took effect as a result of the legislation of the Emperor Hadrian.

The fact that Englishmen differ in their ideas so sharply from other nations in Europe must surely bear some relation to the circumstance that, of all European nations, they have preserved for themselves a larger share of their own national legal conceptions, and refused to suffer their own

system to be superseded by the Roman law, which has left its impress, more or less strongly marked, on the rest of Europe and some of the Colonies, and formed the foundation of their laws. In England, however, the history of spirit and letter presents a remarkable resemblance to the course of legal events in Rome, although in detail there are many points of divergence. Such parallels suggest that the similarity is but an instance of the underlying unity of human moral development. In England, apart from legislation, our Common Law, which with pride we may reflect forms the basis of the law administered to about a quarter of the human race, sprung on our own admission from the consciousness of the people itself. Those customs which were received with the sanction of the King's courts enriched the early stock of our legal conceptions, and our funds from customary sources are not closed even to-day; we are still open to admit into the Common Law a custom, provided it is good in nature and general in prevalence, modernity being no barrier to incorporation.* But such additions to the Common Law have not only been in the main additions from the mercantile usages of the people, but they largely represent an extension or wider application of an already existing principle, rather than the establishment of an entirely novel conception in our law.

The Common Law has not stood still, but on the other hand, it has seldom kept pace with the public consciousness, nor has parliamentary legislation in the earlier years of any state proved to be the most useful means of legal amendment. Our justice has been "royal," it has been the King's justice, the King as Sovereign who is regarded as present in all his courts. But where the particular

* See the following cases:—*Bechuanaland Exploration Co. v. London Trading Bank*, 1898, Q. B., 658 (Kennedy, J.). *Edelstein v. Schuler*, 1902, 1 K. B., 144 (Bigham, J.).

merits of a case could not meet with adequate justice, either because no suitable remedy was at hand in the courts, or because the circumstances were singular, the subject would petition the King as *Parens Patriæ* to hear his prayer. The King in the beginning was accustomed in person to hear the petitions, but as they grew in number he referred them to his Chancellor, who was keeper of the King's conscience as well as keeper of the King's seal. As an ecclesiastic, the Chancellor would regard the ethical rights of the parties rather than their strict relationship to each other at common law. In due course he would give his decree, and afford the relief prayed for, in such cases where he considered the petitioner entitled to an act of grace on the part of the King. In giving relief it has been suggested that he was actuated as much by the desire to afford the wrongdoer an opportunity of purging his own conscience from sin—ethical sin—as by the desire to grant redress to the petitioner. By this process the petitioning of the Chancellor developed into the court of the Chancellor—the Chancery Court—and the precedents formed by successive decrees became a system of law which, contrasted with the Common Law, was termed “Equity.” Equity did not annul the Common Law; only when the exercise of a legal right would be unconscientious, would the Chancery Court restrain a man from pursuing that which otherwise he would be entitled to enjoy. Indirectly, thus, Equity interfered with the law, and basing its line of action on certain fundamental maxims, it built up a parallel legal system which, by reason of the restraining powers and the capacity to “attach”* and

* “Attachment” and “Committal” may be incurred by those who do not carry out the orders of the Court. The distinction between attachment and committal, and the various methods by which the Court charges the property of those in default, are technicalities which it is unnecessary for the present purpose to discuss. Detention in custody for “Contempt of Court” is

“commit” an offender against its decrees, substantially effected a gradual development and expansion of our law. The essence of Equity is perhaps most clearly observed in its maxim—“Equity regards the spirit, not the letter; the intention, not the form.” But he who sought the aid of Equity had his obligations too, for another maxim bids him know “He who seeks Equity must do Equity.” “He who comes into Equity must come with clean hands.”

During the Chancellorship of Lord Eldon, the principles of Equity applied during the previous history of the court became systematized, although only by judicial habit, and not as a result of legislation. In 1873 the Judicature Act consolidated the principles of Equity with those of the Common Law, the basis of the fusion being the doctrine expressed in the phrase “where Equity and Common Law conflict, Equity prevails.” The period of Lord Eldon’s work suggests the stage reached in Roman law by Salvius Julianus, and the Judicature Act effected a fusion of principles similar to that which was brought about by the Codes of Justinian. But the Chancery Division, as the successors of the old Chancery Court, is still concerned with the spheres of work which, prior to the consolidation, were peculiarly the province of Equity. The whole law relating to trust and trustees (that is, the law which deals with the regulation of property, the legal rights or the rights of control being possessed by one for the beneficial enjoyment by another), was entirely the invention of Equity. Such matters are, as before, allocated to the Chancery lawyers and the Chancery Division Courts. The fusion has had the effect in the main of preventing the duplication of procedure, which the conflict between legal

perhaps the more widely known illustration of the exercise by the Chancery Court of the “Strong arm of Equity.” See *Earl of Oxford’s case*, 1 Ch., Rep. 1; *Penn v. Lord Baltimore*, 1750, 1 Ves. Sen. 444; *Ewing v. Orr-Ewing*, 10 App. Ca. 453.

and equitable rights previously rendered probable.* The subject matter before the Common Law Courts and Chancery Courts remains as before, and no student of our legal history would wish it otherwise. For our law is so national, and thus so human, that around its courts there pervades an atmosphere—a sentimental association—which no legislation could easily dispel. In the Chancery Court we see the living manifestation of that search for the intention, that regard for the merits, which in an earlier day was the special machinery for the advancement of our legal system to the stage of progress of our national consciousness. The necessity for conscientiousness is writ large over the Chancery Courts, and we can realize the immensity of its ethical power when we bear in mind the part it has played in the home life and domestic relations of the nation. It is here we see to the full the social aspect of law. The weak were particularly the objects of the protection of Chancery. To those whom the Common Law left without help, Equity lent its aid. The interests of the infant, the lunatic, the married woman were zealously guarded from the risks to which their disabilities rendered them liable.

How legal progress keeps pace with the advancement of public opinion cannot be illustrated more clearly than by the development of the law relating to married women's property. At Common Law, a married woman merged her property with her legal personality in her husband. She had no proprietary rights at law. From the time of Queen Elizabeth, Equity began to protect the property to which a married woman would have been entitled but for the legal disability of marriage. From the era of that illustrious Queen, Equity gradually built for

* See *Ind, Coope & Co. v. Emmerson*, 12 App. Ca. 300, per Lord Watson at p. 308.

married women a structure of rights which rescued her from the position of a legal nonentity, and finally endowed her with an independent personality, but it was not until the forty-fifth year of Queen Victoria's reign that the freedom of action which she enjoyed in Equity was granted to her by law. The famous Married Women's Property Act of 1882, than which there is no more epoch-making statute on the statute book, was substantially the conversion into legal rights of those interests which had been secured for the married woman previously in Equity. The conferment of proprietary independence on the wifehood of a nation is a far-reaching event in its social development. The fact that such a stage in the progress of a nation has been reached by gradual process in the forensic sphere, rather than by parliamentary legislation, illustrates the intense humanity of the vocation of the law, and how each case in court may suggest to a lawyer, privileged to share in its conduct, that in some measure it is recording a movement of humanity—another instance of the striving of mankind to attain a greater degree of truth, a better balance, a nearer approach to an ideal. Equity, too, has kept a jealous eye on these whose personal interests and personal influence might combine to exert undue pressure, and inequitably reap a material advantage by means of misplaced but unshaken confidence; and so it has gone on, and is going on, maintaining, as far as it is humanly possible, fair play in life.

But Equity procedure has had for its venue, except in the cases of the Counties Palatine, the courts in London; and although Chancery has as its rational basis popular protection against the rigours of the strict letter of the Common Law, it must be admitted that from a variety of causes Chancery has inspired a sense of wonder in the minds of those who are its beneficiaries, largely due, it is

suggested, to the characteristics of the atmosphere of its courts, which are probably the most technical of any of the law courts, and to the fact that, as distinct from the Common Law, it is not peripatetic, and its administration has never been carried out in the heart of the country, in each county, within the view of the people themselves. The Common Law, on the other hand, has not only been administered for the people and with the people, in the assizes of the county towns, but by the people themselves as jurymen. Chancery has in practice seldom availed itself of the jury; the layman only knows of Chancery if he is a litigant or a witness, or if in London or one of the Palatine cities a spectator, and spectatorship in Chancery is distinctly an acquired taste.

When Henry II placed the assize system on a firm basis—which in passing it may be noted seems to have been anticipated in Biblical times among the Israelites (see 1 Sam., vii, 15—"And Samuel judged Israel all the days of his life. And he went from year to year in circuit to Beth-el, and Gilgal, and Mizpeh, and judged Israel in all those places")—he made justice not merely more accessible to those who required it to be dispensed, but he brought the whole machinery of law and order in full operation within the sight of all his subjects. An assize became an event in the county—a royal visit in which all the component social elements of the nation were brought together, not merely to administer justice, but to meet to consider the progress of the King's peace since the last foregathering. The attendance of the King, if not in person, by delegate, the high sheriff, together with his chaplain, the magistrates, the landholders, and other "gentlemen of quality" in the persons of the grand jury who presented the criminal cases for trial, and the "country," represented by the petty jurymen, who were

the ultimate triers of the facts, shows how thoroughly typical an assize was of the society of the nation.

The most characteristic professional element was the Bar, who travelled from assize to assize "on circuit" as it is termed, each part of the country being divided into areas with barristers attached to the circuit forming this area. The assize system has had to stand the test of modern criticism like many more ancient institutions, but it is standing the test well, and those who have considered the advantages to the people of the imaginative features of these county gatherings cannot but concede that the assizes form one of the greatest assurances of law and order, and of popular respect and regard and affection for its maintenance. The assizes are the only survival of picturesque mediæval pageantry which is uniform throughout the country. Even in the busiest of our cities we cannot refrain from halting for a moment to glance at the javelin men, to listen to the blare of the trumpeters, to watch the progress of the procession of His Majesty's judges of assize. In our smaller county towns, the assizes form the social gatherings of the county of all sections of the community—the farm labourer, the yeoman farmer, the squire, the parson, the members of the solicitor branch of the legal profession, the magistracy, the chief constable, and so on up to the high sheriff. The Bench and Bar of an assize court, the resplendent robes of the judge, the gorgeous uniform of the sheriff, the chaplain attired in his clerical dress, and at the front the Bar, with their characteristic grey wigs, black gowns and white bands, form a spectacle whose impressive powers are undeniable. This survival of ceremony, with the survival in us of a response of appreciation of ceremony, illustrate the immanence of the idea of the sovereignty which Law has won in the hearts of

men. The Common Law is here embodied in flesh and blood, it is clothed with vitality and humanity. Those who must see to believe, can believe because they see.

Our courts are perhaps most human when they deal with family life, but it is pleasant to realise that, notwithstanding all the social difficulties which are presented for solution, the Bar is, as a whole, optimistic of humanity. The Admiralty Courts open out to us the picture of man scouring the seas and spanning the oceans to win necessities and add to his possessions. It is suggestive in its portrayal of the international aspect of man, his comradeship in his contention with the more powerful forces of nature. Nor can it be gainsaid that the picture of mercantile life—both at sea and on land—is attractive, although its colours be sometimes drab.

The law relating to commerce, and the law of master and servant, bring us in direct touch with man's endeavours to earn a livelihood, to increase his wealth, to advance his material prospects in spheres of activity which are essentially characteristic of town life, and in the magnitude of their operations are peculiarly the product of modernity. Commercial law presents the picture of a society where contract has largely displaced status. Full of throbbing human interest, its portrayal is not without a certain pathos, and the energy and struggle, the necessary consequences of that initiative which is essential where contract is the indispensable precedent to livelihood, contrast not altogether happily with the more peaceful, if less potential, career of the yeoman farmer and the tiller of the soil.

But the humanity of law, and those who have realised it, is never more eloquent than in the parchment title deeds of some old manor. When we have done with them legally, they are yet with us in imagination. Not parch-

ment and words alone are before the eyes of the reader who tries to understand with sympathy. The life of a little world is unfolded. There appears the lord of the manor, inheritor of his ancestor's name, estates, and traditions, the head of a little community—the tenantry bound to the lord, and the lord bound to the tenantry by common interests. We see them at work in the cultivation of the soil, the depasture of the cattle, the lord and the tenantry living by and living on their own land. We see the festive country-folk on May Day around the May-pole, crowning the May Queen. We see the merry-makers upon the village green, some dancing, some playing their games. At Yuletide the tenantry toast the squire for his gifts of good cheer as they sit around the blazing log. We hear the horn heralding the approach of the sportsmen, and soon the hunt in hot chase is upon us, and we see the lord of the manor gaily clad, and admire his horsemanship as he clears one of his own hedges.

Near by, the place of worship preserves the trophies won in the days when lord and yeomen fought together, shoulder to shoulder, for the protection of their motherland, and there many generations have in common celebrated feast and fast, and mourning and rejoicing. It is a refreshing scene, this view of merry villages, peopled by a sturdy yeoman stock whose kinship lies in the seigniori of a worthy squire. Not a musty deed, but the fresh and fragrant scent of the open country, a picture of smiling meadows and green fields presents itself to those who see in these documents the history of old English life on the land.

The Inns of Court, the heart of the law in England, are the most extensive recorders of the human interest of our law, and the human interest of the lawyers. The Inns of Court are the "honourable societies" enjoying the

exclusive right to call to the Bar. The Middle and the Inner Temple were originally institutions of the Knights Templars, but in the fourteenth century they came into the possession of the predecessors of the present members of their societies. Lincoln's Inn and Gray's Inn, in their origin, are quite distinct from the Temple. Mr. Bellot in his *Inner and Middle Temple* deals at length with the part played by the Temple in the social history of the nation :—

Seated midway between the cities of London and Westminster, the lawyers became an important element in the mediæval life of both. With the removal of the Inns of Court and Chancery from the precincts of the city to the western suburb on the banks of the Thames, near Fleet Street, Chancery Lane, and Gray's Inn Fields, these colleges became fashionable seminaries for the education of young noblemen and gentlemen. At this period the undergraduates of Oxford and Cambridge were for the most part the sons of yeomen, tenant-farmers, and artisans, and, moreover, mere boys. And the education at these Inns of Court and Chancery was not merely legal, nor even confined to the classics and other erudite learning, but was a general training for men of position, as we are told by Sir John Fortescue who wrote about the year 1463 of these institutions :—
 “There they learn to sing and exercise themselves in all kinds of harmonye. There also they practise dawnsing, and other noblemen's pastimes, as they used to do which are brought up in the King's House.” And he adds that noblemen placed their children in these Inns, not to have them learned in the law, nor to live by its practise, but to become accomplished and useful citizens.

And throughout the Renaissance, no less than during feudal times, the Inns of Court men continued to be rulers of society. Having no less intimate relations with the royal circle than with the commercial magnates of the city, and comprising a large proportion of men eminent for rank, wealth, learning and wit, they laid down the law equally upon questions of politics as upon those of dress, taste and art. And although in more modern times the gentlemen of the long robe have ceased to occupy such exclusive prominence, they still exercise a powerful influence in the manifold phases of the political and social life of the nation Our history bears witness to the closeness of the bond which unites the Temple, and

all its name implies, with the life of the nation. From its heart has pulsed the life-blood of the people. Here the men who built up our constitution, and the laws under which we live and have our being, worked and died; here those who interpreted and administered these laws on the Bench, or in the Cabinet, received their training; and here, too, toiled those who contributed to our pleasure on the stage, or earned a bare subsistence in the study, that our recreations might be enlarged, and our labours lessened.

In these ancient halls the rolls recount the names of those members of the society who have become famous in the church, the law, in war, in art, in letters, and in other spheres of the life of the nation. The Inns of Court have counted equally as their own those who have practised in the Law and those whose activities have been apart from courts and chambers. In an Inn of Court, except as a cleric attached to the Inn, everyone is counted of the law, whatever history may most relate of him. The coat armour of many a knight, and arms of many an esquire, who has fought his country's battles is found on the walls of the Inn, and hanging from the roof may be found the tattered remains of flags, some carried through a war by members of the Inn, a testimony of the wielding of the sword by those who more often have wielded the weapons of pen and tongue.

Masque and pageant have been held in their halls, and in festive time the fair have tripped it where Chancellors' feet have trodden. Nothing rational in the national life has ever been alien to the Inns of Court. Their places of worship have been famed since their foundation for their notable preachers and the beauty of their music. Their patronage of the drama, of art, and of horticulture is still living, nor is there any likelihood that they will cease to maintain their hold as a national force. Those who are privileged to be members enjoy a rich heritage. Wending our way through the cloisters and courts and archways, a

first glimpse of the Inn brings us back to olden times. We are no longer ourselves of to-day, but of the Inns of Court. Within the hall we look around, and in the mellowed light we see before us the halting of a pageant of the history of England. We derive inspiration from the message wafted from these silent witnesses of our national life, and when we ask ourselves why we regard so lovingly these grey cloistered courts and halls, we know that they are dear to us because of the immortality of their humanity, and when we go forth from them to be in the Law as our predecessors, we go forth with gratitude to our Inn for teaching us to know that Law is an essential of human fellowship, and that human fellowship is an essential of Law, that we should ever remember that Law and Humanity are living, and that the service of Law is after all the service of Humanity.

654498

Literary and Philosophical Society of
Liverpool
Proceedings.
v. 61(1907/'10)

P Sci
L

DATE	NAME OF BORROWER

**University of Toronto
Library**

**DO NOT
REMOVE
THE
CARD
FROM
THIS
POCKET**

Acme Library Card Pocket
LOWE-MARTIN CO. LIMITED

